DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 299 253

SP 030 639

AUTHOR

Melograno, Vincent; Loovis, E. Michael

TITLE

A Comparative Analysis of Physical Educators Needs

(1980 and 1988) For Teaching Handicapped Students.

PUB DATE

38 88p.

NOTE PUB TYPE

Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical

Data (110)

EDRS PRICE

MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS

*Adapted Physical Education; Comparative Analysis;

Disabilities; Elementary Secondary Education;

*Individualized Education Programs; Motor

Development; Needs Assessment; *Physical Education

Teachers; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher

Effectiveness

ABSTRACT

Results of comprehensive needs assessments conducted in 1980 and 1988 were compared relative to appropriate physical education for handicapped students as mandated by PL 94-142. A direct, self-report methodology was used covering various dimensions of teacher needs. Although there was a significant improvement of the teachers who had served on a multi-disciplinary staff for developing Individualized Education Programs, teachers' misunderstandings of PL 94-142 in 1980 were confirmed in 1988. While there was greater interest in teaching handicapped students, it was no better than "neutral/mixed". A majority of the teachers in 1980 and 1988 indicated a general need for assistance in motor behavior assessments. A majority of the teachers received encouragement and support from their administration in 1980, however, in 1988 there was a decline in support. Both in 1980 and 1988, over 75 percent of the teachers believed that handicapped students are excluded from participation in physical education due to the "nature of the handicap" and "functional ability." Results confirmed that teachers still lack the instructional capacities necessary to conduct physical education in the least restrictive environment. (JD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made

from the original document.



A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PHYSICAL EDUCATORS' NEEDS (1980 AND 1988) FOR TEACHING HANDICAPPED STUDENTS

Vincent Melograno, Ed.D.

E. Michael Loovis, Ph.D.

Cleveland State University

Vincent Melograno is a professor and coordinator of student services and E. Michael Loovis is an associate professor and coordinator of special/adapted physical education, Department of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, Cleveland State University, Cleveland, Ohio 44115.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) "

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.



<u>CONTENTS</u>

<u>Pa</u>	<u>qe</u>
Background	1
Methods	5
Results and Conclusions	8
Experience in Teaching Learners with Special Needs	8
Existing Abilities of Teachers	3
Attitudes of Teachers Toward Handicapped Learners	4
Status of Physical Education Programming 10	6
Expressed Needs	8
Limitations on Handicapped Learners 19	9
Discussion	1
References	6
Appendix A: Survey Instrument - 1980 2	7
Appendix B: Questions and Question Responses - 1980 3	4
Appendix C: Survey Instrument - 1988 5	2
Appendix D: Questions and Question Responses - 1988 5	7



A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PHYSICAL EDUCATORS' NEEDS (1980 AND 1988) FOR TEACHING HANDICAPPED STUDENTS

Background

All handicapped children can be insured of a free, appropriate education which includes special education and any related services that are necessary to meet their unique needs. Professional educators and schools, in general, have had since 1978 to comply with the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142). Often overlooked or neglected in this provision has been the fact that physical education (motor development) is to be a part of each handicapped child's education. In fact, physical education is the only curricular area specifically delineated in both legislative mandates. In PL 94-142, special education was defined as specially designed instruction to meet the unique needs of a handicapped child including classroom instruction, instruction in physical education, home instruction, and instruction in hospitals and institutions.

The concept of appropriate instructional methodology resulted in the emphasis on the Individualized Education Program (IEP) which specifies that a program must be designed to meet an individual's unique needs. Therefore, physical education (motor development) is considered a legitimate need, with its own goals and objectives, and not simply a method or means to an end.



In 1980, a comprehensive needs assessment was conducted in the state of Ohio (Loovis & Melograno, 1981; Melograno & Loovis, 1982) relative to the provisions for appropriate physical education programming incident to PL 94-142. More specifically, the study attempted to ascertain the educational needs of elementary and secondary public school physical education teachers. Several dimensions of perceived teacher needs in relation to physical education for learners with handicapping conditions were studied.

The results and conclusions from this study revealed several issues and problems regarding the continuous professional development of Ohio's physical educators relative to providing programs for handicapped students. Foremost among these problems was the need to clarify and identify the contribution of physical education to the IEP process (i.e., multi-disciplinary staffing). In general, physical educators seemed to lack a comprehensive understanding of PL 94-142 resulting in misunderstandings about their responsibilities. This aspect of the study was sufficient evidence to warrant continued emphasis on the rules and regulations of PL 94-142 as part of inservice activities. In regard to a vehicle for delivery of information about handicapped students in physical education, the data clearly established the use of activities other than graduate and continuing education courses.

In terms of job-related competencies, teachers generally acknowledged that they needed information about assessment



techniques, specific hardicaps, and behavior management techniques. The teachers, as a group, reported a positive attitude toward providing education programs for handicapped students. However, the transformation from positive attitudes to the effective integration (inclusion) of handicapped students into regular class activities seemed unattainable. Teachers were basing the exclusion of students on the nature of the individual's handicap, functional ability, and activity chosen.

Recently, the Education of the Handicapped Act Amendments of 1986 (PL 99-457) was passed which authorized discretionary programs under the Act. As with its predecessor, the new act defines special education as including <u>instruction in physical</u> education. Additional impetus for mandated physical education has been provided by PL 99-457 with special attention given to secondary education and transitional services for handicapped youth. Among other program priorities, emphasis will be directed toward: "Specifically designed physical education . . . programs to increase the potential of handicapped youths for community participation" (Section 626, B, 10).

Given the previous findings and the passage of PL 99-457, these investigators felt that it was timely to conduct a follow-up study similar in nature to the original 1980 study. The previous study confirmed the fact that teaching professionals did not possess the curricular and instructional competencies which are necessary to effectively implement the IEP.



The purpose of this follow-up study (Loovis & Melograno, 1988; Melograno & Loovis, in press) was identical to the original study; that is, to conduct a comprehensive, follow-up needs assessment relative to the provisions for appropriate physical education programming for handicapped students incident to PL 94-142 and now PL 99-457. Results from the 1988 needs assessment revealed that several issues and problems persist in the continuous professional development of Ohio's physical educators. These problems included, but are not limited to the following:

- Teachers lack a comprehensive understanding of the federal laws resulting in numerous misunderstandings about responsibilities.
- Teachers are not involved in the multi-disciplinary staffing process for developing the Individual Education Program (IEP).
- Teachers need information about assessment techniques, procedures for organizing and conducting adapted physical education programs, and behavior management techniques.
- Teachers exclude students based upon the nature of students' handicap, functional ability, and activity chosen.



Methods

The 1980 and 1988 studies examined dimensions of perceived teacher needs in relation to physical education for learners with handicapping conditions. In order to conduct a meaningful needs assessment, one that would yield the kind of information required to address teacher's needs, a direct self-report methodology was utilized.

In 1980, the mail questionnaire (direct self-report) consisted of 36 items that included approximately 150 sub-items. The survey instrument appears in Appendix A. In 1988, the questionnaire developed for the 1980 study was used, as revised to the extent warranted in accordance with PL 99-457. It consisted of 26 items that included approximately 131 sub-items. The survey instrument appears in Appendix C. Various aspects were covered including: (1) experience in teaching learners with special needs, (2) existing abilities of teachers, (3) attitudes of teachers toward handicapped learners, (4) status of physical education programming for handicapped learners, (5) expressed needs, and (6) limitations on handicapped learners. Other areas were incorporated in relation to learners with special needs such as knowledge of the laws, curriculum offerings, instructional strategies, facilities, and equipment as these aspects relate to the implementation of PL 94-142 and PL 99-457.

In 1980, a random, statewide sample with oversampling in Northeast Ohio was selected representing urban, suburban, and rural school districts. The sample was drawn from 30 counties



and 35 school districts. The questionnaire was mailed to a total of 950 physical education teachers. Completed questionnaires were returned by 241 teachers for a return rate of 25%. A single stage follow-up procedure was employed consisting of a postcard reminder.

In 1988, the random, statewide sample with oversampling in Northeast Ohio was drawn from the same counties and school districts that participated in the 1980 survey. Twenty-one of the counties and 22 of the school districts were represented. The questionnaire was mailed to a total of 813 physical education teachers. In an attempt to increase response rate, a single stage follow-up procedure was employed consisting of a postcard reminder. In addition, all respondents were eligible for a "prize" determined by draw. Completed questionnaires were returned by 242 teachers for a return rate of 30%.

The 1980 and 1988 comprehensive statewide needs assessments were identical in two significant aspects. First, the samples were drawn from the same of counties and school districts.

Second, the same basic questionnaire (some items were eliminated or slightly altered) was used. Therefore, this eight year time period can be analyzed and general conclusions can be drawn without the confounding effects of different samples and instruments.

With the completion of the 1988 statewide needs assessment, another important aspect of this systematic evaluation was available. It involved comparison of existing practice in 1988



with what was determined to be prevalent practice in 1980. In this way, the authors can move beyond description of the status of physical education for handicapped students in the years studied to a more statistical portrayal of the differences between 1980 and 1988. Simply stated, has physical education for students with handicapping conditions improved, stayed the same, or become worse?

Collected data were computer-analyzed in consultation with the Cleveland State University Computer Center. Survey data were coded on a personal computer and transferred to a mainframe computer for analysis utilizing an appropriate statistical package. Basic frequency and percentage data were calculated for each questionnaire item. In addition, two-way analyses were calculated across three categories; namely: sex (male/female), educational setting (urpan/suburban/rural), and educational experience (5 year increments from 1 to 26 and over). A dependent t-test was calculated for comparing the various items of the 1980 and 1988 surveys. Significance was established at the .05 level of confidence.



Results and Conclusions

The descriptive characteristics of the subjects are presented in Table 1. Teachers in 1988 were slightly older and had more years of experience than the teachers in 1980. In addition, the 1988 sample was represented by a greater proportion of females and teachers from urban settings than in 1980.

Several results are relevant to those involved in professional development (inservice training) and professional preparation (preservice training). These results are organized according to the various aspects of the needs assessment that were previously identified. Specific frequency and percentage data are presented along with the comparative analyses of the 1980 and 1988 needs assessments. The 1988 questionnaire item number from which these data were derived is indicated in parentheses. Item raw data for 1980 and 1988 appear in Appendices B and D, respectively. The comparative data for selected survey items are presented in Table 2. These items also correspond in number to the 1988 questionnaire.

Experience in Teaching Learners with Special Needs

Generally, physical educators have had more experience teaching handicapped students. In 1980, 59% of the teachers reported they had experience teaching handicapped students, while 81% of the teachers in 1988 indicated a similar level of experience (Item 11). This result is difficult to interpret since there was an increase from 39% to 52% during this period



Table 1

Descriptive Characteristics of Subjects

Variable	1980 (n = 241)	1988 (n = 242)
Age (mean)	36.5 years	38.0 years
Years Experience (mean)	13.0 years	14.3 years
Sex:		
Male (%)	113 (46.9%)	115 (47.5%
Female (%)	102 (42.3%)	122 (50.4%
No Response (%)	2′ (10.8%)	5 (2.1%
School Setting:		
Urban (%)	153 (63.1%)	194 (80.2%
Suburban (%)	39 (16.2%)	21 (8.7%
Rural (%)	22 (9.1%)	22 (9.1%
No Response (%)	27 (11.2%)	5 (2.1%
School Enrollment:		
1 - 200 (%)	5 (2.1%)	5 (2.1%
200 - 500 (%)	34 (14.1%)	64 (26.4%
500 - 1000 (%)	101 (41.9%)	87 (35.9%
1000 - 1500 (%)	52 (21.6%)	52 (21.5%
1500 - 2000 (%)	17 (7.1%)	17 (7.0%
2030+ (%)	9 (3.7%)	9 (3.7%
No Response (%)	23 (9.5%)	8 (3.3%



Table 2

Response of 1980 and 1988 Teachers to Selected Survey Items

in Needs Assessment ($\overline{X} \pm SD$)

Item	1980	1988	p
(1) What is the total number of handicapped students who participate in all of your physical education classes?	3.^1 <u>+</u> 1 4		<.01
(3) What is your feeling toward teaching physical education for students with handicapping conditions?	2.12 <u>+</u> 0.93		NS
(5) PL 94-142 mandates that handicapped children receive, if necessary, special education including instruction in physical education. How capable are you in executing the following responsibilities:			
Identifying federal and state legislative requirements associated with individualized education programs.	2.81 <u>+</u> 0.90	2.62 <u>+</u> 0.92	<.05
Developing an individualized education program for the handicapped student.	2.25 <u>+</u> 0.74		< .05
Demonstrating appropriate instructional strategies in the classroom with handicapped students.	2.29 <u>+</u> 0.78	2.09 <u>+</u> 0.77	<.05
Effectively using commercial and teacher-made instructional materials.	2.06 <u>+</u> 0.78	1.91 <u>+</u> 0.78	<.05
Identifying federal and stat legislative requirements associated with the principle of nondiscriminatory evaluation.	2.87 <u>+</u> 0.90	2.56 <u>+</u> 0.86	<.01
Identifying federal and state legislative requirements associated with the principle of mainstreaming.	2.50 <u>+</u> 0.91	2.43 <u>+</u> 0.90	NS
Assessing educational placements in defining the least restrictive appropriate placement for a handicapped student.	2.59 <u>+</u> 0.83	2.40 ±0.87	<.01



(7) Have you taken any steps to increase your knowledge of each of the following in order to 'ceach physical education to handicapped students more effectively?

Knowledge of PL 94-142	0.21 <u>+</u> 0.40	0.33 <u>+</u> 0.47	<.01
Understanding the nature of specific handicaps	0.54 <u>+</u> 0.50	0.64 <u>+</u> 0.48	<. 05
Techniques of motor assessment	0.41 ±0.49	0.49 +0.50	NS
Awareness of existing curricular material	0.32 +0.47	0.40 +0.49	NS
Knowledge of medical terms	0.42	0.52 <u>+</u> 0.50	<. 05
Hands on experience with handicapped students	0.41 <u>+</u> 0.49	0.61 <u>+</u> 0.49	<. 01
Procedures for organizing and running adapted physical education programs	0.37 <u>+</u> 0.48	0.47 <u>+</u> 0.50	<. 05
<pre>Knowledge of class placement alternatives (i.e., special, adapted, and so on)</pre>	0.22 <u>+</u> 0.42	0.36 <u>+</u> 0.48	<. 01
Understanding of behavior management techniques	0.33 <u>+</u> 0.47	0.51 <u>+</u> 0.50	<.01
(8b) Have you served on a multi-disciplinary staff for the purpose of developing an individualized education program for a handicapped student?	1.07 <u>+</u> 0.26	1.15 ±0.36	<.01
(10) What is your feeling toward providing physical education programs for students with handicapping conditions?	1.79 ±0.85	1.70 <u>+</u> 0.86	NS
(16) Do you receive encouragement and support from your administration (i.e., principal, superintendent, school board, etc.) to provide physical education for handicapped students?	0.85 <u>+</u> 0.36	0.33 <u>+</u> 0.47	<.01
(19) To what extent do you interact with the medical and allied medical (i.e., physicians, physical therapist, occupational therapist) professions in your community relative to providing physical education for handicapped students?	0.33 <u>+</u> 0.47	0.50 <u>+</u> 1.58	NS
(20) How interested are you in teaching handicapped students (compared to teaching non-handicapped 5-udents)?	1.52 <u>+</u> 0.50	0.17 <u>+</u> 0.71	<. 01
All the state of t			

for teachers who indicated that handicapped students do not attend their school. In 1980, 4% of the teachers responded that handicapped students attended their school but did not participate in physical education. In 1988 +his figure decreased to slightly more than 3% (Item 15).

The total number of handicapped students who participate in physical education classes increased significantly (Table 2) during the period under investigation. While the increase, on the average, was from approximately 8 to 10 students, 67% and 54% of the teachers indicated they had no more than 10 students in their program in 1980 and 1988, respectively (Item 1).

In 1980, only 7% of the teachers had served on a multidisciplinary staff for the purpose of developing an
individualized education program (IEP) for handicapped students
in physical education (Item 8b). Although a significant
(Table 2) improvement was indicated by 1988 (14%), this increase
is misleading. What is significant is that in 1980, 93% of the
teachers had not served in this capacity. By 1988, 86% of the
teachers still had not served on a multi-disciplinary staff. In
both years, no difference was found between males and females,
but teachers from rural school settings served on IEP staffs to a
greater extent then had teachers from urban and suburban school
settings. In response to these findings, two conclusions seem
probable. First, physical education has been neglected by the
"powers-to-be" in terms of involvement in the multi-disciplinary
staff process. Second, physical educators have been remiss in



becoming involved in the process. Both parties are accountable and share equally in this act of negligence.

Existing Abilities of Teachers

When discussing the present abilities of career physical educators in Ohio, it is with more than just passing interest to examine the extent to which adapted physical education courses were taken during undergraduate preparation. In 1980, 37% of the teachers reported having completed only a portion of a course or no course at all. Although the figure was reduced to 29% in 1988, this still represents a large percentage of teachers who have not even completed one course in adapted physical education (Item 21). This further illustrates the need for more comprehensive preparation of teachers as well as for more purposeful, continuous professional development activities.

when asked to respond either "yes" or "no" to six interpretive statements pertaining to PL 94-142, only 36% of the teachers, on an average, answered all items correctly in 1980. Although knowledge of the law had improved by 1988, still only 51% of the teachers, on an average, answered all items correctly (Item 4). In both years, two statements which should have been answered "no" b. a received "yes" responses more frequently, were indicative of the teachers' misunderstandings. The statements were:



- Mainstreaming means educating <u>all</u> handicapped children in the regular classroom.
- Adapted physical education must be provided for <u>each</u> handicapped student.

Teachers were asked to rate their perceived capability to execute seven responsibilities associated with PL 94-142 (Item 5). Teachers' perceived capability increased significantly (Table 2) between 1980 and 1988 for six of the seven responsibilities. On the average, 50% and 62% of the teachers, respectively rated themselves at least "somewhat capable."

Teachers were asked, "Have you taken any steps to increase your knowledge . . . in order to teach physical education to handicapped students more effectively?" (Item 7) Nine areas were presented to the teachers. In 1980, only 35% of the respondents had made any attempt to increase their knowledge and/or skills. By 1988, it was 46%. This overall positive change was significant (Table 2) in the case of seven of the nine areas. The only areas in which there were no significant changes were "techniques of motor assessment" and "awareness of existing curricular material."

Attitudes of Teachers Toward Handicapped Learners

Teachers' attitudes toward handicapped students were virtually the same in 1988 as they were in 1980 as revealed by a number of different survey items. Although not significant (Table 2), there were less favorable responses in terms of



feelings toward <u>teaching</u> physical education to handicapped students (Item 3). In 1980, 67% of the teachers reported they were at least "favorably" inclined. The percentage diminished to 63% in 1988. In 1980, "very favorable/favorable" feelings were higher for males (70%) than for females (61%). These feelings changed in opposite directions in 1988 for males (63%) and for females (65%).

The number of at least "favorable" responses was 77% in 1980 and 78% in 1988 when the question was generally stated to inloude feelings about providing physical education for handicapped students (Item 10). Response by males (80% and 77%) and females (77% and 81%) was nearly the same in the "very favorable/favorable" categories in both 1980 and 1988.

In 1980, respondents' positive attitude was evident when, as a group, 63% of the teachers felt at least "favorable" toward teaching students with a variety of handicapping conditions (Item 12). This item covered 12 handicaps including a range of learning and behavioral disorders, physical impairments, sensory impairments, and other health related conditions. In 1988, 48% of the teachers responded at least "favorable." It becomes obvious, however, that these moderately positive attitudes are diminished since only 36% (1980) and 35% (1988) of the teachers were at least "somewhat interested" in teaching handicapped students compared to teaching nonhandicapped students (Item 20). It should be stated, however, that overall response to this item in 1988 was significantly (Table 2) different from that in 1980.



That is, teachers' "interest" was more favorable in 1988.

This overall, greater "interest" may too be misleading. In 1980, slightly more than 12% of the teachers chose not to respond to this item; only 3% declined to answer the question in 1988. This figure reflects the magnitude of the increase seen in the "neutral/mixed" category (29% to 39%) in 1980 and 1988, respectively. In the final analysis, nearly one-fourth of all teachers may be "somewhat uninterested" or "very uninterested" in teaching handicapped learners; interest of most teachers (62%) may be no better than "neutral/mixed."

Status of Physical Education Programming

Teachers were given a list of 12 standard handicapping conditions; namely: amputation, arthritis, blind/visually handicapped, cardiac disorders, cerebral palsy, deaf/hearing impaired, severe behavior handicap, learning disabilities, mental retardation, muscular dystrophy, wheelchair-bound, and multihandicapped. They were asked if they meeded additional information in order to work more effectively with each type of student (Item 13). In 1980, most teachers (69%) suggested they had such a need, on the average. The figure remained somewhat constant when, in 1988, 67% of the respondents reported similar needs. As to why teachers felt that they had a need for more information in order to teach more effectively, the most common reasons across categories in both 1980 and 1988 were "lack of program content" and "lack of specialized training."



In 1980, a majority of teachers (57%) had received encouragement and support from their administration to provide physical education for handicapped students (Item 16). By 1988, a majority of teachers (51%) had not received such encouragement and support. This difference was found to be statistically significant (Table 2). It points out the continuing lack of emphasis placed on physical education for handicapped students by district and building administrators.

Response to this item was also analyzed for the crosstabulation categories (sex, educational setting, and educational experience). In 1980, teachers from suburban school settings (67%) and teachers with 21-25 years experience (62%) received the most encouragement and support from their administration. Males and females received "equal" encouragement from administration whereas less than half of urban teachers received encouragement and support. In 1988, the only teachers receiving strong encouragement and support from their administrators were those with 26 or more years experience (72%). The majority of male teachers (55%), suburban (58%) and rural teachers (52%), and teachers with 11-15 years experience (52%) received encouragement and support. By comparison, less than half of female teachers (42%) and urban teachers (42%) received encouragement and support from the administration along with the other educational experience categories.



Expressed Needs

In 1988, when potential areas of need were specified and teachers were asked to respond as to their needs, 73% of the respondents, on the average, indicated need for information across all items (Item 6). The data indicated that of the nine possible areas of concern "knowledge of PL 94-142" continues as the number one need (Item 9). In 1980, the remaining three areas of greatest need (in descending order of need) were: understanding the nature of specific handicaps, techniques of motor assessment, and understanding of behavior management techniques. Some shifting of priorities occurred in 1988. After "knowledge of PL 94-142, the three areas of greatest need (in descending order of need) were: understanding of behavior management techniques, procedures for organizing and running adapted physical education programs, and techniques of motor assessment.

In terms of "techniques of motor assessment", a majority (57%) of the teachers indicated a general need for assistance in this area in 1988 (Item 8a). This is an increase over the 1980 needs assessment wherein 52% of the teachers had indicated such a need. Not only is the percent increase noteworthy, but the actual number of teachers, which the percentage represents, is also considerable since the provision for assessment prior to placement in the least restrictive environment is one of the explicit guarantees in PL 94-142.

Teachers were asked to reveal the extent to which they



interact with medical and allied medical professionals relative to providing physical education for handicapped students (Item 19). No significant (Table 2) change was found between 1980 and 1988. Of those responding, 52% and 60% of the teachers, respectively, indicated that they never engage in this form of consultation.

Limitations on Handicapped Learners

Teachers were asked to indicate the limits on handicapped students from participation in regular physical education classes (Item 17). The majority of teachers in both surveys specified the following limitations (in descending order of greatest limitation):

- Nature of the individual's handicap
- Functional ability of the individual
- Activity chosen
- Availability of facilities/equipment.

Significant is the fact that in 1980, 78% of the teachers, on the average, felt that these limitations were the primary reason for exclusion from regular classes. In 1988, only 67% of the respondents expressed these same feelings. Although a change in this direction and of this magnitude is no doubt desirable, it is still disheartening to think that two-thirds of the physical educators in the state of Ohio believe that these are legitimate reasons for exclusion.

A collateral concern in physical education programs which



peers. Teachers were asked if nonhandicapped students demonstrate behaviors characterized as hostility, ridicule, and/or resentment (Item 18). In 1980, nearly half of the teachers (42%) reported that almost no negative reactions were discernable, while 26% indicated that "some" negativism was present. In 1988 over half of the teachers (52%) reported no negative reactions, while 23% indicated that "some" negativism was present. Interpretation of these data indicate that negative attitudes and behavior have diminished during the period since completion of the first needs assessment. This is an expected outcome of implementing the least restrictive environment and could be the result of a better social climate in schools generally.



Discussion

In an attempt to summarize the current status of physical education for handicapped students, overall results were analyzed with a view toward the majority of responses across items. Thus, the profile of the 1988 physical educator, male or female, is that he/she:

- is 38 years of age with 14 years of teaching experience.
- has taken only one undergraduate course in teaching physical education to handicapped students.
- has a total of <u>0-10 handicapped students</u> who participate in his/her program.
- teaches at a school where most handicapping conditions are not represented.
- does <u>not receive encouragement and support</u> from his/her administration to provide physical education for handicappec students.
- <u>feels</u> at best "somewhat capable" in carrying out
 PL 94-142.
- misunderstands PL 94-142; thinks that an adapted physical education placement must be provided for each handicapped student.
- needs more information on all aspects of physical education for handicapped students, particularly: knowledge of PL 94-142, understanding of behavior management techniques, and understanding the nature of



specific handicaps.

- feels a need to <u>expand</u> his/her <u>knowledge</u> across a range
 of handicapping conditions.
- has taken some steps to increase his/her knowledge.
- has at least a "favorable" <u>feeling</u> toward teaching handicapped students and providing physical education programs, but only a "neutral/mixed" <u>interest</u> in teaching handicapped students compared to teaching nonhandicapped students.
- feels at least "favorable" toward <u>teaching</u> a range of handicapping conditions <u>except</u> severe behavior handicap and multihandicapped.
- has not served on a multi-disciplinary staff for developing IEPs.
- limits the full participation of handicapped students in regular physical education on the basis of "nature of the individual's handicap," "functional ability of the individual," and "activity chosen."
- does <u>not interact</u> with the medical and allied medical professions relative to providing physical education for handicapped students.

Given this profile, it is clear that the status of physical education for handicapped students has generally remained the same during the period of time since 1980. If, in 1980, the State of Ohio had been performing admirably or, at least, had been making strides toward more admirable performance, then the



status quo would be more acceptable. However, the 1980 needs assessment results were anything but complementary.

Consequently, the determination in 1988 that substantive change had not occurred leads to the definitive conclusion that the status of physical education for handicapped students in the state of Ohio is one of noncompliance with federal regulations. Teachers indicate that handicapped students are present in their buildings but not in the physical education program - this is noncompliance! Teachers indicate that they are not involved in testing handicapped students prior to placement in least restrictive environments - this is noncompliance! Students are placed in either regular physical education programs or special/adapted physical education classes without the benefit of motor assessment; therefore, placement decisions are being made on purely subjective criterion - this is noncompliance!

The results of this comparative analysis also lead to several recommendations that relate directly to the above profile. Physical education has been neglected by the "powersto-be" in terms of involvement in the multi-disciplinary staff (IEP process) and physical educators have been remiss in becoming involved. Both parties are accountable and share equally in this act of negligence. RECOMMENDATION 1: Clarify and identify the contributions of physical education in the IEP process.

In general, physical educators appear to lack a comprehensive understanding of PL 94-142 resulting in misunderstandings about their responsibilities. The profession



is, at best, split on the issue of whether it has the knowledge and/or skills to effectively teach handicapped sindents.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Emphasize the rules and regulations of PL 94-142 as part of professional preparation and inservice activities.

Physical education teachers, as a group, reported a positive attitude toward providing programs for handicapped students. However, the transfer from positive attitudes to the effective integration (inclusion) of handicapped students into regular motor development activities seems less clear. Teachers revealed a greater "interest" in non-handicapped students, and they still base the exclusion of tudents on the nature of the individual's handicap and functional ability. RECOMMENDATION 3: **Ecknowledge (insist) that handicaps do not exclude learners, but the error and curricula do.

Professionals should possess (or acquire) the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values needed to implement the IEP process in the most effective means possible within the least restrictive environment. All handicapped students should (must) be in some physical education placement. RECOMMENDATION 4: Require that motor behavior assessment be conducted and interpreted by persons qualified to do so.

providing encouragement and support for the motor development component of handicapped students' education. The commitment to motor programs does not begin and end with the physical educator



RECOMMENDATION 5: <u>Insure that administrators are fully involved</u>

and committed to an "appropriate" education including motor

development.

A more focused and intense effort is needed on the part of school boards, superintendents, principals, teachers, parents, and citizens to achieve even the simplest change. Only through such effort will any improvements be made in the quantity and quality of services provided to handicapped learners in physical education before the next needs assessment.



References

- Loovis, E. M., & Melograno, V. (1981, Spring). Physical educators and handicapped students: An Ohio needs assessment. <u>Future</u>

 <u>Focus</u>, pp. 13-15.
- Loovis, E. M., & Melograno, V. (1988, Fall). Physical education and handicapped students: 1988 Ohio needs assessment. <u>Future</u> Focus, 10(1), 30-32.
- Melograno, V., & Loovis, E. M. (1982). Motor development

 programs for school-aged handicapped students: Assessing the

 needs of professional educators. Cleveland, OH: Cleveland

 State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service Nc.

 ED 212 618)
- Melograno, V., & Loovis, E. M. (in press). Motor development

 programs for school-aged handicapped students: A follow-up

 needs assessment. Cleveland, OH: Cleveland State University.

 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service)



APPENDIX A Survey Instrument - 1980



-28-ALL RESPONSES WILL BE HELD IN STRICT CONFIDENCES Date_ County_ School District_ Title of Person Completing This Form _ Please check the box or circle the appropriate responses to the questions below. Feel free to add your comments on any question either on this form or on a separate sheet of paper. Please check an answer for all questions. Give the answer which is closest to your view if no LEAVI response applies exactly. BEANI 1) About how many handicapped students participate in your physical education classes? ☐ 1. None 2.1-5 **3.6-10** 4. 10-14 □ 5, 15-19 G 6, 20-39 □ 7.40+ 2) Of the handicapped students who participate, what number are: _ integrated into regular classes 2. ____ segregated into special classes 3. ____ both __ other (Please describe: _ 3) What is your feeling toward teaching physical education for students with handicapping conditions? □ 1. Very ☐ 2. Favorable ☐ 3. Neutral/ 4. Unfavorable ☐ 5. Verv favorable Mixed unfavorable 4) How interested are you in expanding your knowledge of physical education programming for handicapped students through participating in conferences, workshops, school inservice programs and the like? ☐ 1. Very ☐ 2. Interested ☐ 3. Neutral/ 4. Uninterested ☐ 5. Very ☐ 8. Haven't interested Mixed uninterested thought about it 5) How interested are you in enrolling in graduate courses which emphasize theoretical and practical considerations of physical education programming for handicapped students? 🛘 1. Very ☐ 2 Interested ☐ 3. Neutral/ ☐ 4. Uninterested 5. Very ☐ 8. Haven't interested Mixed uninterested thought about it 6) Which of the following does the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-142) provide for? a) Mainstreaming all handicapped children in the regular classroom. ☐ 1. Yes □ 2 No b) Funds at the local level to provide teachers with inservice activities ☐ 1. Yes □ 2 No designed to help them teach handlcapped students. c) An individualized education program for each handicapped student. ☐ 1. Yes ☐ 2 No d) Adapted physical education placement for each handicapped student. 🗆 1. Yes □ 2. No e) Assessment of students' abilities with valid and reliable test instruments. □ 1. Yes □ 2 No f) Parents' participation in the development of the individualized education program, □ 1. Yes □ 2 No including placement of the student in the appropriate physical education class. 7) P.L. 94-142 mandates that handicapped children receive, if necessary, special education including instruction in physical education. How capable are you in executing the following responsibilities: a) Identifying federal and state legislative requirements associated with individualized education programs. ☐ 1. Very capable ☐ 2. Somewhat capable ☐ 3. Somewhat incapable ☐ 4. Very incapable b) Developing an individualized education program for the handicapped student. ☐ 1. Very capable 2. Somewhat capable ☐ 3. Somewhat incapable 4. Very incapable c) Demonstrating appropriate instructional strategies in the classroom with handicapped students. 1. Very capable ☐ 2. Somewhat capable ☐ 3. Somewhat incapable 4. Very incapable d) Effectively using commercial and teacher-made instructional materials. ☐ 1. Very capable 2. Somewhat capable ☐ 3. Somewhat incapable 4. Very incapable e) Identifying federal and state legislative requirements associated with the principle of zero reject. ☐ 1 Very capable ☐ 2. Somewhat capable 3. Somewhat incapable 4. Very incapable f) Identifying federal and state legislative requirements associated with the principle of nondiscriminatory evaluation 1. Very capable ☐ 2. Somewhat capable ☐ 3. Somewhat incapable 4. Very incapable g) Identifying federal and state legislative requirements associated with the principle of mainstreaming. ☐ 1 Very capable ☐ 2. Somewhat capable 3. Somewhat incapable 4. Very incapable h) Assessing educational placements in defining the least restrictive appropriate placement for a handicapped student. ☐ 1. Very capable ☐ 2. Somewhat capable ☐ 3 Somewhat incapable 4. Very incapable 8) Do you feel you need more information on each of the following in order to teach physical education to handicapped students more effectively?

☐ 1. Yes

☐ 1 Yes

1 Yes

Yes

1. Yes

☐ 0. No

□ 0 No

□ 0. No

☐ 0. No

□ 0 No



1 Knowledge of PL, 94-142

3. Techniques of motor assessment

5 Knowledge of medical terms

2. Understanding the nature of specific handicaps

4 Awareness of existing curricular materials

				•	•	
				1	-29-	LEAVI
	6. Hands-on experience with handicapped	students		☐ 1. Yes	□ 0. No	
	7. Procedures for organizing and running ad			1. Yes	□ 0. No	
	8. Knowledge of class placement alternative		d, and so on)	☐ 1. Yes	□ 0. No	
	9. Understanding of behavior management to		,	☐ 1. Yes	□ 0. No	
	10. Other		_			
	11. Other					
9)	physical education to handicapped stud	our knowledge of ear	ch of the follow y?	_	_	
	1. Knowledge of P.L. 94-142	taaa		☐ 1. Yes	0. No	
	 Understanding the nature of specific hand Techniques of motor assessment 	icaps		1. Yes	0. No	
	4. Awareness of existing curricular material			☐ 1. Yes☐ 1. Yes☐	□ 0. No□ 0. No	
	5. Knowledge of medical terms			☐ 1. Yes	0. No	
	6. Hands on experience with handicapped si	udents		□ 1. Yes	□ 0. No	
	7. Procedures for organizing and running ad-	pled P.E. Programs		1. Yes	- 0. No	
	8. Knowledge of class placement alternative	s (1.e., special, adapted	t, and so on)	☐ 1. Yes	□ 0. No	
	9. Understanding of behavior management to	chniques		☐ 1. Yes	□ 0. No	
	10. Other					1
10a.)	In which areas of motor behavior assess	sment do you need a	ssistance?			ļ
	Fundamental Motor Skills/Patterns			☐ 1. No	2 Yes	
	Physical/Motor Fitness			☐ 1. No	2 Yes	
	Sports Skills Tests (including aquatics and d	ance)		☐ 1. No	O 2 Yes	
	Perceptual-Motor Development			1. No	2 Yes	
	Other (Specify)			<u> </u>	2 Yes	
b.)		staff for the purpose udent?	of developing			
		was the experience for	-			
	☐ 1. Very ☐ 2. Somewhat rewarding	☐ 3. Not very rewarding	☐ 4. Very unrewardir			
11)	Of the areas listed in questions 8 and 9, need for information about at the present (Only the number of these three alternal)	t time? Please list ir	order of great	have the greatest est to least pricrity.		
	# #	<u></u>	#			
12)	What is your feeling toward providing phenomena:	ysical education pro	ograms for stud	lents with handicappin	g	
	favorable	depends	4. Unfavorable	☐ 5. Very unfavorable		
13)	Have you ever taught a student with each such students are you currently teaching		nditions? If so,	approximately how ma	iny	
	1. AMPUTATION	□ 0. No	□ 1. Yes	How many		
	2. ASTHMA	□ 0. No	☐ 1. Yes —	How many		
	3. ARTHRITIS	□ 0. No	☐ 1. Yes →	How many		
	4. BLIND/VISUALLY HANDICAPPED	☐ 0. No	□ 1. Yes -	How many		
	5. CARDIAC DISORDERS	☐ 0. No	□ 1. Yes →	How many		
	6. CEREBRAL PALSY	□ 0. Na	☐ 1. Yes →	How many		
	7. DEAF/HEARING IMPAIRED	☐ 0. No	□ 1. Yes	How many]
	8. DIABETES	[] O. No	□ 1. Yes →	How many		
	9. EMOTIONAL DISTURBANCE	0. No	1. Yes -	How many	·	
	10. EPILEPSY (SEIZURE PRONE)	□ 0 No	1. Yes —	How many		•
	11. LEARNING DISABILITIES 12. MENTAL RETARDATION	□ 0. No	☐ 1, Yes →	How many		
	13. MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY	□ 0. No □ 0. No	1. Yes —	How many		
	14 POSTURAL DEVIATIONS	□ 0. No	□ 1. Yes =	How many		 -



15 WHEELCHAIR-BOUND

16. OYHLR (PLEASE SPECIFY)

_ O. No O. 1. Yes - How many____

□ 0. No

32

~	\sim	
• •	11-	

				ŧ	-30-
hat is your feel	ing towards 'eaching	a student with ea	ch of the following	conditions?	
☐ 1. Very favorable	2. Favorable	3. Neutral/ it depends	☐ 4. Unfavorable	☐ 5. Very unfavorable	☐ 6. Don't know
2. ASTHMA 1. Very lavorable	2. Favorable	☐ 3. Neutral/ it depends	☐ 4. Unfavorable	☐ 5. Very unfavorable	☐ 6. Don't know
3. ARTHRITIS 1. Very lavorable	2. Favorable	3. Neutral/	☐ 4. Unfavorable	5. Very unfavorable	☐ 6. Don't know
4. BLIND/VISUA 1. Very lavorable	LLY HANDICAPPED 2. Favorable	3. Neutral/	4. Unfavorable	5. Very	☐ 6. Don't know
5. CARDIAC DIS	ORDERS 2. Favorable	☐ 3. Neutral/ it depends	☐ 4. Unlavorable	5. Very unlavorable	□ 6. Don't know
6. CEREBRAL P. 1. Very lavorable	ALSY ☐ 2. Favorable	3. Nautral/	☐ 4. Unfavorable	5. Very	· 🛘 6. Don't know
7. DEAF/HEARIN	NG IMPAIRED 2. Fevorable	3. Neutral/	☐ 4. Unfavorable	5. Very	☐ 6. Don't know
8. DIABETES 1. Very lavorable	2. Favorable	3. Neutral/	☐ 4. Unfavorable	☐ 5. Very	☐ 6. Don't
9. EMOTIONAL 1. Very lavorable	DISTURBANCE 2. Favorable	3. Neutral/	☐ 4. Unfavorable	☐ 5. Very	☐ 6. Don't
10. CPILEPSY (SE	EIZURE PRONE) 2. Favorable	3. Neutral/	☐ 4. Unfavorable	5. Very	☐ 6. Don't
11. LEARNING DI	SABILITIES 2. Favorable	3. Neutral/	☐ 4. Unlavorable	5. Very	☐ 6. Don't
12. MENTAL RET 1. Very layorable	ARDATION 2. Favorable	3. Neutral/	4. Unlavorable	☐ 5. Very	☐ 6. Don't
13. MUSCULAR D	DYSTROPHY 2. Favorable	☐ 3. Neutrat/	☐ 4. Unlavorable	5. Very	☐ 6. Don't
14. POSTURAL D	EVIATIONS 2. Favorable	it depends	☐ 4. Unfavorable	☐ 5. Very	☐ 6. Don't
15. WHEELCHAIL 1. Very	R-BOUND 2. Favorable	it depends	☐ 4. Unfavorable	☐ 5. Very	☐ 6. Don't
favorable 16. OTHER 1 Very	2. Favorable	it depends	4. Unlavorable	unfavorable	know ☐ 6. Don't
favorable 17. OTHER 1. Very	2. Favorable	ıt depends ☐ 3. Neutral	4. Unfavorable	unfavorable	know ☐ 6. Don't
oflowing conditioned that you need	d to expand your knowl ins in order to teach ph additional information what are the reasons t	ysical education fo in order to work m	or such students more nore effectively with e	elfectively? If you ach of the following	knaw
1 AMPUTATION	_	.	O No	□ 4 tooket	
1 Yes -	2. Can't communicate wit		Dislike near them	 4. Lack of program content 	
☐ 5. Fear make condition worse 2 ASTHMA	☐ 6. Need too mattention	nuch 0 7. traini	Lack of specialized ng 0. No	□ 8. Other	
1 Yes -	2. Can't communicate wit	h them being	Dislike near them Lack of specialized	4 Lack of program content 8 Other	
☐ 5 Fear make	☐ 6. Need too m	וטכח יו יו	Lack of Specialized		





attention

training

16. OTHER (PLEASE S	SPECIFY)		O. No			
1 Yes -	☐ 2. Can't communicate with the	nem be	3. Dislike ing near them		Lack of	
5. Fear make condition worse	☐ 6. Need too muc attention		7. Lack of special	.8 🗀 besite	Other	
17. OTHER (PLEASE S		u-	0. No	•		
1. Yes	2. Can't communicate with the communicate with		3. Dislike		Lack of	
☐ 5. Fear make	☐ 5. Need too muc		7. Lack of specia	• •	m content Other	
Condition worse Of the conditions listed	attention above which have you	u Indicated vo	ining u need more info	ormation on, which	th three do you	
need most? Please list	_ #	ieasi ileeo. (i	##	r or each of these	e need be given.)	
Of the following handic education program? (P	capping conditions, while ase circle)	nat Is their cur		our school and pl	ysical `	
		Do not attend the school at which I teach	Attend but de not have P.E. classes	Attend but have separate P.E.	Attend and are integrated into regular P.E. classes	
1. AMPUTATION		1	2	3	4	
2. ASTHMA		1	2	3	4	
3. ARTHRITIS		1	2	3	4	
4. BLIND/VISUALLY		1	2	3	4	
E. CARDIAC DISORDI	-	1	2	3	4	
a. CEREBRAL PALSY		1	2	3	4	
7. DEAF/HEARING IM	IPAIRED	1	2	3	4	
8. DIABETES	.===	1	2	3	4	
9. EMOTIONAL DIST		1	2	3	4	
10. EPILEPSY (SEIZUR	•	1	2	3	4	
11. LEARNING DISABI		1	2	3	4	
12. MENTAL RETARDA		1	2	3	4	
13. MUSCULAR DYSTR		1	2	3	4	
14. POSTURAL DEVIAT		1	2	3	4	
15. WHEELCHAIR-BOL		1	2	3	4	
16. OTHER (PLEASE S	PECIFY)					
		1	2	3	4	
17. OTHER (PLEASE SI	PECIFY					
Do you receive encoura	gement and support fr	1 om your admir	2 ristration (I.e., p	3 rincipal, superinte	4 endent,	
school boar etc.) to pr	rovide physical educal type of encouragement?	ion for handic	apped students	? Please describ	9.	
□ 0 No → What	encouragement do you	need?				
If handicapped students	are placed in your red	ular physical	education class			
participating fully in act	tivities with normal stu	dents? (Pleas Yes	e circle) No	o, what illing (i		
1 Activity chosen		1	. 0			
2. Total number of stude		1	0			Ī
3. Functional abitity of t		1	0			!
4. Nature of the individu	ial's handicap	1	0			Ì
			0			- [
5. Avaitability of facilities	s/equipment	1	U			•
		1	0		•	
5. Avaitability of facilities	ural barriers	1	•		•	
5. Avaitability of facilitie 6 Presence of architect	ural barriers	. 1	•		•	



80-2012

eveland State University • Cleveland, Ohio 44115 • Communications Research Center

APPENDIX B Questions and Question Responses - 1980



Please check the box or circle the appropriate responses to the questions below. Feel free to add your comments on any question either on this form or on a separate sheet of paper. Please check an answer for all questions. Give the answer which is closest to your view if no response applies exactly.

1. About how many handicapped students participate in your physical education classes?

None	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	57	(23.7%)
1-5 .	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	77	(31.9%)
6-10	•	•			•	•	•	•	•	•		•	28	(11.6%)
10-14	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•		•	19	(7.9%)
15-19	•	•			•		•	•	•	•		•	14	(5.8%)
20-39	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	25	(10.3%)
40+	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	18	(7.5%)
No res	pon	se	•	•					•	•			3	(1.2%)

2. Of the handicapped students who participate, what number are:

Integrated into regular classes.	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	154	(3.3 ave.)
Segregated into special classes.	•				•	•	•		28	(3.2 ave.)
Both	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	21	(2.7 ave.)
Other (please describe:)								9	(2.8 ave.)

3. What is your feeling toward teaching physical education for students with handicapping conditions?

Very favorable .	•		•	•	•		•	•		69	(28.6%)
Favorable		•	•	•	•				•	92	(38.2%)
Neutral/mixed .		•		•	•	•	•	•	•	63	(26.1%)
Unfavorable		•		•	•	•	•	•	•	13	(5.4%)
Very unfavorable	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	3	(1.2%)

4. How interested are you is expanding your knowledge of physical education programming for handicapped students through participating in conferences, workshops, school programs and the like?

Very interested	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•			48	(19.9%)
Interested		•	•	•				•	•	•	•	•			119	(49.4%)
Neutral/mixed	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	53	(22.0%)
Uninterested		•		•	•		•		•		•	•	•	•	12	(5.0%)
Very uninterest	ed	•		•	•	•	•	•	•			•		• ;	2	(0.8%)
Haven't thought	ab	out			•			•		•	•	•			7	(2.9%)

5. How interested are you in enrolling in graduate courses which emphasize theoretical and practical considerations of physical education programming for handicapped students?

Very interested	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	29	(12.0%)
Interested		•		••		•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	67	(27.8%)
Neutral/mixed		•		•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	٠	•	67	(27.8%
Uninterested		•			•	•	•	•	•		•	•	٠	•	50	(20.7%)
Very úninterest	ed	•			•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	ز	(2:1%)
Haven't thought	ab	.ut	it	•		•		•					•	•	22	(9.1%)

6. Which of the following does the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-14?) provide for?

			Yes		No	No	response
(a)	Mainstreaming all handicapped children in the regular classroom	118	(49.0%)	69	(28.6%)*	54	(22.4%)
(b)	Funds at the local level to provide teachers with inservice activities designed to help them teach handicapped students	89	(36.9%)*	86	(35.7%)	66	(27.4%)
(c)	An individualized education program for each handicapped student	99	(41.1%)	77	(31.9%)*	65	(27.0%)
(b)	Adapted physical education placement for each handicapped student	111	(46.1%)	66	(27.4%)*	64	(26.6%)

			Yes		No	No	response
(e)	Assessment of students' abilities with valid and reliable test instruments	110	(45.6%)*	63	(26.1%)	68	(28,2%)
(f)	Parents' participation in the development of the individualized education program, including placement of the student in the appropriate physical education class	104	(43.1%)*	75	(31.1%)	62	(25.7%)

*Correct response

7. P.L. 94-142 mandates that handicapped children receive, if necessary, special education including instruction in physical education. How capable are you in executing the following responsibilities:

	Very capable	Somewhat capable	Somewhat incapable	Very incapable	No response	
(a)	Identifying programs.	federal and state	legislative requirem	ments associated	with individualiz	ed education
	12 (5.0%)	83 (34.4%)	73 (30.3%)	63 (26.1%)	10 (4.1%)	
(b)	Developing a	n individualized e	ducation program fo	or the handicappe	ed student.	
	25 (10.4%)	141 (58.6%)	51 (21.2%)	16 (6.6%)	8 (3.3%)	
(c)	Demonstration	ng appropriate inst	ructional stategies	in the classroo	om with handicappe	d students.
	30 (12.4%)	122 (50.6%)	62 (25.7%)	17 (7.1%)	10 (4.1%)	
(b)	Effectively	using commercial	nd teacher-made ins	tructional mater	rials.	
	51 (21.2%)	127 (52.7%)	42 (17.4%)	12 (5.0%)	9 (3.7%)	
(e)	Identifying zero reject.		legislative require	ements associated	with the princip	le of
	6 (2.5%)	45 (18.7%)	79 (32.8%)	92 (38.2%)	19 (7.9%)	
(f)	, ,	federal and state atory evaluation.	legislative require	ments associated	with the princip	le of
	12 (5.0%)	71 (29.5%)	76 (31.5%)	66 (27.4%)	9 (6.6%)	

VerySomewhatSomewhatVeryNocapableincapableincapableresponse

(g) Identifying federal and state legislative requirements associated with the principle of mainstreaming.

24 (10.0%) 108 (44.8%) 54 (22.4%) 42 (17.4%) 13 (5.4%)

(h) Assessing educational placements in defining the least restrictive appropriate placement for a handicapped student.

15 (6.2%) 97 (40.2%) 79 (32.8%) 34 (14.1%) 16 (6.6%)

8. Do you feel you need more information on each of the following in order to teach physical education to handicapped students more effectively?

	•		Yes		No	<u>No</u>	response
(1)	Knowledge of P.L. 94-142	218	(90.5%)	22	(9.1%)	1	(0.4%)
(2)	Understanding the nature of specific handicaps	205	(85.1%)	36	(14.9%)	0	(0.0%)
(3)	Techniques of motor assessment	198	(82.2%)	43	(17.8%)	0	(C.O%)
(4)	Awareness of existing curricular materials	217	(90.0%)	23	(9.5%)	1	(0.4%)
(5)	Knowledge of medical terms	187	(77.6%)	53	(22.0%)	1	(0.4%)
(6)	Hands-on experience with handicapped students	194	(80.5%)	44	(18,3%)	3	(1.2%)
(7)	Procedures for organizing and running adapted P.E. programs	199	(82.6%)	40	(16.6%)	2	(0.8%)
(8)	Knowledge of class placement alternatives (i.e., special, adapted, and so on)	210	(87.1%)	24	(10.0%)	7	(2.9%)
(9)	Understanding of behavior management techniques	192	(79.7%)	43	(17.8%)	6	(2.5%)
(10)	Other	11	(4.6%)	0	(0.0%)	230	(95.4%)
(11)	Other	3	(1.2%)	0	(0.0%)	238 -	(98.8%)

44

9. Have you taken any steps to increase your knowledge of each of the following in order to teach physical education to handicapped students more effectively?

			Yes		No
(1)	Knowledge of P.L. 94-142	48	(19.9%)	186	(77.2%)
(2)	Understanding the nature of specific handicaps	128	(53.1%)	108	(44.8%)
(3)	Techniques of motor assessment	97	(40.2%)	140	(58.1%)
(4)	Awareness of existing curricular materials	75	(31.1%)	161	(66.8%)
(5)	Knowledge of medical terms	98	(40.7%)	137	(56.8%)
(6)	Hands-on experience with handicapped students	97	(40.2%)	138	(57.3%)
(7)	Procedures for organizing and running adapted P.E. programs	87	(36.1%)	149	(61.8%)
(8)	Knowledge of class placement alternatives (i.e., special, adapted, and so on)	53	(22.0%)	184	(76.3%)
(9)	Understanding of behavior management techniques	77	(31.9%)	155	(64.3%)
(10)	Other	0	(0.0%)	0	(0.0%)

10a. In which areas of motor behavior assessment do you need assistance?

		No		Yes	No response		
Fundamental motor skills/patterns	112	$(\frac{10}{46}.5\%)$	119	(49.4%)	10	(4.1%)	
Ihysical/motor fitness	126	(52.3%)	105	(43.6%)	10	(4.1%)	
Sports skills tests (including aquatics and dance)	112	(46.5%)	119	(49.4%)	10	(4.1%)	
Perceptual-motor development	74	(30.7%)	160	(66.4%)	7	(2.9%)	
Other (specify)	2	(0.8%)	11	(4.6%)	228	(94.6%)	
Other (specify)	2	(0.8%)	6	(2.5%)	233	(96.7%)	

10b. Have you served on a multi-disciplinary staff for the purpose of developing an individualized education program for a handicapped student?

(If yes) How rewarding was the experience for you?

11. Of the areas listed in questions 8 and 9, which three areas do you feel you have the greatest need for information about at the present time? Please list in order of greatest to least priority. (Only the number of these alternatives need be given)

#1 Knowledge of P.L. 94-142 24.9%

#2 Understanding the nature of 21.2% specific handicaps

#9 Understanding of behavior 14.1% management techniques

12. What is your feeling toward providing physical education programs for students with handicapping conditions?

 Very favorable
 ...
 101 (42.0%)

 Favorable
 ...
 85 (35.3%)

 Neutral/it depends
 ...
 36 (14.9%)

 Unfavorable
 ...
 ...
 5 (2.1%)

 Very unfavorable
 ...
 ...
 2 (0.8%)

 No response
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...

÷ 0

13. Have you ever taught a student with each of the following conditions? If so, approximately how many such students are you currently teaching?

					Ever Taught	ı	
			No		Yes	No	response
(1)	Amputation	142	(58.9%)	80	(33.2%)	19	(7.9%)
(2)	Asthma	13	(5.4%)	223	(92.5%)	5	(2.1%)
(3)	Arthritis	122	(50.6%)	102	(42.3%)	17	(7.1%)
(4)	Blind/visually handicapped	127	(52.7%)	102	(42.3%)	12	(5.0%)
(5)	Cardiac disorders	88	(36.6%)	142	(58.7%)	11	(4.6%)
(6)	Cerebral palsy	134	(55.6%)	92	(38.2%)	15	(6.2%)
(7)	Deaf/hearing impaired	81	(33.6%)	149	(61.8%)	11	(4.6%)
(8)	Diabetes	74	(30.7%)	154	(63.9%)	13	(5.4%)
(9)	Emotional disturbance	53	(22.0%)	174	(72.2%)	14	(5.8%)
(10)	Epilepsy (seizure prone)	51	(21.2%)	180	(74.7%)	10	(4 1%)
(11)	Learning disabilities	19	(7,9%)	216	(89.6%)	6	(2.5%)
(12)	Mental retardation	95	(39.4%)	132	(54.8%)	14	(5.8%)
(13)	Muscular dystrophy	182	(75.5%)	43	(17.8%)	16	(6.6%)
(14)	Postural deviations	96	(39.8%)	131	(54.4%)	14	(5.8%)
(15)	Wheelchair-bound	189	(78.4%)	31	(12.9%)	21	(8.7%)
(16)	Other (please specify)	3	(1.2%)	35	(14.5%)	203	(84.2%)

14. What is your feeling towards teaching a student with each of the following conditions?

	Very favorable	Favorable	Neutral/ it depends	U Javorable	Very unfavorable	Don't know	No response
(1)	Amputation						
	53 (22.0%)	93 (38.6%)	60 (24.9%)	17 (7.1%)	2 (0.8%)	11 (4.6%)	4 (1.7%)
(2)	Asthma						
	99 (41.1%)	106 (44.0%)	28 (11.6%)	2 (0.8%)	2 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (1.7%)
(3)	Arthritis						
	73 (30.3%)	116 (48.1%)	35 (14.5%)	2 (0.8%)	1 (0.4%)	8 (3.3%)	5 (2.1%)
(4)	Blind/visually	y handicapped					
	47 (19.5%)	74 (30.7%)	77 (31.9%)	25 (10.4%)	5 (2.1%)	9 (3.7%)	4 (1.7%)
(5)	Cardiac disord	iers					
	49 (20.3%)	69 (36.9%)	68 (28.2%)	22 (9:1%)	4 (1.7%)	5 (2.1%)	3 (1.2%)
(6)	Cerebral palsy	,					
	40 (16.6%)	69 (28.6%)	86 (35.7%)	28 (11.6%)	4 (1.7%)	10 (4.1%)	3 (1.2%)
(7)	Deaf/hearing i	impaired					
	73 (30.3%)	110 (45.6%)	46 (19.1%)	3 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (2.5%)	3 (1.2%)
(8)	Diabetes						
	92 (38.2%)	113 (46.9%)	25 (10.4%)	2 (0.8%)	2 (0.8%)	4 (1.7%)	3 (1.2%)
(9)	Emotional dist						_
	46 (19.1%)	77 (31.9%)	82 (34.0%)	19 (7.9%)	10 (4.1%)	4 (1.7%)	3 (1.2%)
(10)	Epilepsy (seiz	ure prone)					
	59 (24.5%)	101 (41.9%)	52 (21.6%)	17 (7.1%)	5 (2.1%)	3 (1.2%)	4 (1.7%)
(11)	Learning disab	oilities					
	86 (35.7%)	93 (38.6%)	48 (19.9%)	8 (3.3%)	1 (0.4%)	2 (0.8%)	3 (1.2%)
						•	

	. Very favorab		Fav	orable		tral/ depends	Unf	avorable		Very avorable		Don't know	re	No sponse	
(12)	Mental	retardati	ion								_				
	56 (23	3.2%)	85	(35.3%)	62	(25.7%)	18		6	(2.5%)	11	(4.6%)	3	(1.2%)	
(13)	Muscula	er dystro	oh y												
	40 (16	6.6%)	70	(29.0%)	7?	(31.9%)	29	(12.0%)	5	(2.1%)	16	(6.6%)	4	(1.7%)	
(14)	Postura	ıl deviati	lons												
	6 <i>t</i> (26	6.6%)	104	(43.2%)	44	(18.3%)	13	(5.4%)	3	(1.2%)	9	(3.7%)	4	(1.7%)	
(15)	Wheelch	air-bound	i												
	34 (14	.1%)	53	(22.0%)	77	(31.9%)	42	(17.4%)	11	(4.6%)	21	(8.7%)	3	(1.2%)	
(16)	Other			-											
	7 (2.	9%)	4	(1.7%)	4	(1.7%)	2	(0.8%)	1	.(0.4%)	1	(0.4%)	222	(92.1%)	
(17)	Other			_											
	2 (0.	8%)	4	(1.7%)	1	(0.4%)	1	(0.4%)	0	(0.0%)	1	(0.4%)	232	(96.3%)	

15. Do you feel a need to expand your knowledge of physical education programming for each of the following conditions in order to teach physical education for such students more effectively? If you feel that you need additional information in order to work more effectively with each of the following types of students, what are the reasons tha contribute to your need? CHECK ALL THAT APPLY.

Can t communicate with them
Dislike being near them
Lack of program content
Fear make condition worse
Need too much attention
Lack of specialized training
Other

(Item continued)

[.j

			Yes		No	No	response
(1)	Amputation	188	(78.0%)	31	(12.9%)	21	(8.7%)
(2)	Asthma	133	(55.2%)	65	(27.0%)	43	(17.8%)
(3)	Arthritis	148	(61.4%)	49	(20.3%)	44	(18.3%)
(4)	Blind/visually impaired	199	(82.6%)	22	(9.1%)	20	(8.3%)
(5)	Cardiac disorders	175	(72.6%)	40	(16.6%)	26	(10.8%)
(6)	Cerebral palsy	195	(80.9%)	20	(8,3%)	25	(10.4%)
(7)	Deaf/hearing impaired	165	(68.5%)	43	(17.8%)	32	(13.3%)
(8)	Diabetes	116	(48.1%)	69	(28,6%)	56	(23,2%)
(9)	Emotional disturbance	163	(67.6%)	44	(18,3%)	34	(14,1%)
(10)	Epilepsy (seizure prone)	143	(59.3%)	57	(23,7%)	41	(17.0%)
(11)	Learning disabilities						
(12)	Mental retardation						
(13)	Muscular dystrophy	193	(80.1%)	19	(7.5%)	28	(11.6%)
(14)	Postural deviations	146	(60.6%)	55	(22.8%)	40	(16.6%)
(15)	Wheelchair-bound	198	(82.2%)	19	(7.9%)	24	(10.0%)
1111	0.1 (1						

- (16) Other (please specify)
- (17) Other (please specify)
- 16. Or the conditions listed above, which have you indicated you need more information on; which three do you need most? Please list in order of greatest to least need. (Only the <u>number</u> of each of these need be given)
 - #4 Blind/visually impaired 16.6%
 - #7 Deaf/hearing impaired 10.4%
 - #13 Muscular dystrophy 8.3%



-44-

17. Of the following handicapping conditions, what is their current status in your school and physical education program? (Please circle)

	Do not attend the school at which I teach 1) Amputation	Attend but do not have P.E. classes	Attend buc have separate P.Eclasses	Attend and are integrated into regular P.E. classes	No response
(1)	Amputation				
	170 (70.5%)	13 (5.4%)	3 (1.2%)	31 (12.9%)	24 (10.0%)
(2)	As thma				
	16 (6.6%)	3 (1.2%)	1 (0.4%)	210 (87.1%)	11 (4.6%)
(3)	Arthritis				
	82 (34.0%)	5 (2.1%)	5 (2.1%)	118 (49.0%)	31 (12.9%)
(4)	Blind/visually	handicapped			
	140 (58.1%)	10 (4.1%)	7 (2.9%)	65 (27.0%)	19 (7.9%)
(5)	Cardiac disorde	rs			
	61 (25.3%)	30 (12.4%)	4 (1.7%)	119 (49.4%)	27 (11.2%)
(6)	Cerebral palsy				
	140 (58.1%)	12 (5.0%)	9 (3.7%)	51 (21.2%)	29 (12.0%)
(7)	Deaf/hearing im	paired			
	97 (40.2%)	6 (2.5%)	6 (2.5%)	108 (44.8%)	24 (10.0%)
(8)	Diabetes				
	47 (19.5%)	5 (2.1%)	3 (1.2%)	161 (66.8%)	25 (10.4%)
(9)	Emotional distu	rbance			
	61 (25.3%)	8 (3.3%)	10 (4.1%)	145 (60.2%)	17 (7.1%)
(10)	Epilepsy (seizu	re prone)			
	55 (22.8%	5 (2.1%)	3 (1.2%)	156 (64.7%)	22 (9.1%)

	Do not attend the school at which I teach		not	end but have P lasses	-	sep	end but parate classes	P.E.	e int	end and are egrated into egular P.E. classes		No ponse
(11)	Lea	arning disal	oilities							•		
	23	(9.5%)	6	(2.5%)		12	(5.0%)	188	(78.0%)	12	(5.0%)
(12)	Mer	ntal retarda	ation							_		
	111	(46.1%)	3	(1.2%)		6	(2.5%)	97	(40.2%)	23	(9.5%)
(13)	Mus	cular dyst	cophy									
	176	(73.0%)	6	(2.5%)		7	(2.9%)	25	(10.4%)	27	(11.2%)
(14)	Pos	tural devia	ations									
	87	(36.1%)	7	(2.9%)		4	(1.7%	;	116	(48.1%)	27	(11.2%)
(15)	Whe	elchair-bou	ınd									
	160	(66.4%)	16	(6.6%)		10	(4.1%))	18	(7.5%)	37	(15.4%)
(16)	0 t h	er (please	specify)				_					
	2	(0.8%)	1	(0.4%)		5	(2.1%)	7	(2.9%)	225	(93.4%)
(17)	Oth	er (please	specify)				_					
		(0.4%)		(0.0%)			(1.2%))	3	(1,2%)	234	(97.1%)
Do :	you r ool b	eceive enco	ouragemen to prov	t and so	upport sical e	from y	our adı on for	ninis hand	tration (licapped s	i.e., princip tudents? Ple	al, su ase de	perintendent, scribe.
		Yes						120	(49.8%)			
		What type	of enco	urageme	nt?							
		No						91	(37.8%)			
		What enco	ouragemen	t do you	need?		-					
		No respon	ise	• •	• •	• •	• •	30	(12.4%)			61

CJ

18.

19. If handicapped students are placed in your regular physical education classes, what limits them from participating fully in activities with normal students? (Please circle)

			Yes		No	No	response
(1)	Activity chosen	158	(65.6%)	55	(22.8%)	26	(10.8%)
(2)	Total number of students in the class	106	(44.0%)	102	(42.3%)	31	(12.9%)
(3)	Functional ability of the individual	179	(74.3%)	35	(14.5%)	25	(10.4%)
(4)	Nature of the individual's handicap	192	(79.7%)	28	(11.6%)	18	(17.5%)
(¿)	Availability of facilities/ equipment	143	(59.3%)	69	(28.6%)	28	(11.6%)
(6)	Presence of architectural barriers	72	(29.9%)	128	(53.1%)	40	(16.6%)
(7)	Other (please specify)	11	(4.6%)	2	(9%)	227	(94.2%)

20. In your integrated classes, how many of the regular students react to the students with handicaps by being:

	Almost all	Most	About half	Some	Almost none	No response
(a)	Hostile					
	1 (0.4%)	2 (0.8%)	4 (1.7%)	53 (22.0%)	124 (51.5%)	44 (18.3%)
(b)	Curious	1				
	10 (4.1%)	22 (9.1%)	22 (9.1%)	90 (39.3%)	40 (16.6%)	43 (17.8%)
(c)	Neutral					
	36 (14.9%)	55 (22.8%)	33 (13.7%)	45 (18.7%)	10 (4.1%)	48 (19.9%)
(a)	Accommodating					
	43 (17.8%)	77 (31.9%)	15 (6.2%)	46 (19.1%)	7 (2.9%)	39 (16.2%)

(Item continued)

Fiz

(e)	Almost all Overly conside	<u>Most</u> rate	About half	Some	Almost none	No response
	10 (4.1%)	30 (12.4%)	16 (6.6%)	87 (36.1%)	42 (17.4%)	43 (17.8%)
(f)	Ridiculing					•
	0 (0.0%)	5 (2.1%)	3 (1.2%)	82 (34.0%)	97 (40.2%)	40 (16.6%)
(g)	Resentment					
	3 (1.2%)	2 (0.8%)	3 (1.2%)	51 (21.2%)	124 (51.5%)	45 (18.7%)

21. What things do you enjoy about providing physical education to handicapped students?

22. What things do you not enjoy about providing prysical education to handicapped students?

23. What unique problems with the handicapped students you work with are you experiencing?

24. Do you need information on how to interact more effectively with the medical and allied medical (e.g., school nurse, physical therapist, occupational therapist) professions in your community relative to providing physical education for handicapped students?



25. How interested are you in teaching handicapped students (compared to teaching non-handicapped students)?

26. As an undergraduate, did you have any specialized instruction in teaching physical education to handicapped students?

27. Have you ever had a relative or close friend who was handicapped?

28. What was your age on your last birthday?

N = 213

Mean = 36.5 years

Median = 35.5 years

Range = 22 to 63 years

29. What is your sex?

30. For how many years have you been teaching?

N = 215

Mean = 13.0 years

Median = ...3 years

Range = 1 to 38 years

31. How much education have you completed?

32. If you are a college graduate, what is the name of the college where you earned your degree?

33. Do you teach at only one school or do you alternate between schools?

34.	What	is	the	appro	xima	ate	to	tal	en	rol	1me	nt	of	the	sch	1001(s)	at which	you	teach?
				0-200	•	•	•	•		•		•		•		5	(2.1%)		
				200-5	00	•		•		•				•		34	(14.1%)		
				500-1	000			•			•			•	•	1.	(′.1.9%)		
				1000-	1500)		•				•				52	(21.6%)		
				1500-	2000)					•			•	•	17	(7.1%)		
				2000+			•						•	•		9	(3.7%)		
				No rea	s por	se	•			•		•		•	•	23	(9.5%)		
35.	Would	i yo	ou de	escrib	e tł	ne s	ch	001	(s)	at	wh	ict	ı yo	ou te	each	as:			
				Urban	,			•						•		153	(63.1%)		
				Suburl	an		•			•	•			•		39	(16,2%)		
				Rural								•		•	•	22	(9.1%)		
				No re	spcr	ıse	•	•				•	•	•		26	(10.8%)		
36.	Are y	/Ou	cur	rently	tak	ing	z a:	ny (con	tin	uin	gε	duc	atio	on c	ourses	?		
				No .				•			•	•		•		173	(71.8%)		
				Yes												45	(18.7%)		

No response 23 (9.5%)

APPENDIX C

Survey Instrument - 1988



110

CODE: ---

ALL RESPONSES WILLABE HELD IN STRICT CONFIDENCE

					_)a!e			
County _				Sc	hool District				
Title of Pa	erson Completing Ti	hie Form							
Please o	heck the box or o	his Form	esponses to	the guestion	e helow Feel	free to add up			T GAVE
on any q	luestion either on	this form or on a separ st to your view if no res	ate sheet of	paper. Pleas	check an an	iswer for al! qu	estions. Gi	ve	BLANK
1) What is	s the total number of han	dicapped students who particip							
_		.4 🗍 3 6-10 🛄 4. Do participate, what number are		5 15-19	☐ 6. 20-39	☐ 7. 40+			
		regular classes	2	segregate	d into special clas	ises			
	both				se describe)	
_		ching physical aducation for sta			_				
	Very favorable	2 Favorable		utrai/Mixed	4 Unfav	rorable	☐ 5 Very u	nlavorable	
		Education for All handicapped			provide for?		_		
		ndicapped children in the reg					1 Yes	[] 2. No	
0,	runds at the local levi	el to provide teachers with ins	service activities	s designed to he	ip them teach har	ndicappes	C . Yaa	C 2 %	1
c)		astron program for each bon	d. a. a. a. a. d. a. b. a.				1 Yes	2 No	 —
		acation program for #** han		_	ecial education.		1 Yes	2 No	l ——
		ucation placement for each na					1 Yes	2 No	I ——
		nts' abilities with valid and rel					1 Yes	□ 2 No	l
ŋ	Parents participation student in the approp	in the development of the inc riate physical education clas	ir Gualized edu S	ication program	ncluding placen	nent of the	1 Yes	2 No	
5) P.L. 94 How ca	i-1/2 mandates that hand gable are you in executi	dicapped children receive, if ne ng the following responsibilitie:	cassary, special	education includi	ng instruction in ph	ysical oducation.			
		and state legislative requirem		i with incloseduali	zed education ord	wrame.		,	
	I 1 Very capable			_	newhat incapable	~	rncapable		
b	•	ndualized education program				1 4 761	TRAPADIE		j
	☐ 1 Very capable				newhat incapable	LI. Ven	/ incapable		
c) Cemonstrating app	ropnate instuctional strategie	s in the classro		•				
	🗀 1 Very capable				newhat incapable	☐ 4 Ven	rincapable		
a) Effectively using co	mmercial and teacher-made	instructional ma	itenals.			, ,		l
	T Very capable	☐ 2 Somew	hat capable	□ 3 Son	newnat incapable	C 4 Ven	rincapable		1
e) 'dentifying federal a	and state legislative requirem	ent associated v	with the principle	e of nondiscrimina	story evaluation			
	I 1 Very capable				newhat incapable		ncapable		
•		and state registative requirem				-			
_	2 1 Very capable	-			newhat incapable	_	rincapatile		
3.		onal placements in defining th							
6) 0e	T 1 Very capable				newhat incapable		rincapable		
	Knowledge of P L 94	rmation on each of the following	IN OTHER THE CHACK	i hukancan sesean	ou m ravercabbed	_			i
	-					<u>_ 1 Yes</u>			
	-	iture of specific halidicads				C: Yes			
	Techniques of motor a					T 1 Yes	_ 0 No		
1	Awareness of existing	curnicular materials				T Yes	_ 0 No		i
5	Knowledge of medical	u terms				C 1 Yes	_ C 0 No		
•	Hands-on experience	with handicapped students				🗀 : Yes	_ 0 Ne		
7	Procedures for organi	izing and running adapted P	E programs			_ 1 Yes			
		lacement alternatives (i.e. sc	-	and so ont		C 1 Yes			
		avior management techniqui			U				
		-		,	· ~	C 1 Yes	<u> 0 No</u>		
	Other								
Y ERIC	Other	_							1

54	LEAVE
	DLANK

7) Have you taken any steps to increase your knowledge of o	ach of the following in order t	o teach physics	l education to hand	sicupped student	i mare effectively	7	OCALL.
1 Knowledge of P.L. 94-142	·			_	·-	•	
2. Understanding the nature of specific handical	105			1 Yes	0 No		
3 Techniques of motor assessment				1 Yes	O No		
4 Awareness of existing cumcular material				1 Yes			
5 Know'edge of medical terms				1 Yes			
6. Hands on experience with handicapped studi	ents			1. Yes			
7 Procedures for organizing and running adapt	ed P.F. nmorama						
8. Knowledge of class placement alternatives (i.	e special adapted and o	2001		O 1 Yes			
9. Understanding of behavior management tech	vinies	July		1. Yes			
10. Other				1. Yes	0. 🗝		
							
Ea.) In which areas of motor behavior assessment do you no	od assistance?						1
Fundamental Motor Skills/Patterns				1. No	0. Yes		
Physical/Motor Fitness				1. No	0. Yes		
Sports Skills Tests (Including aquatics and dance)			1. No	0. Yes		
Percentual-Motor Development				[] 1 No	0. Yes		
Other (Specify)				[] 1 No	O Yes		
Other (Specify)							
				<u> </u>	0 Yes		
b.) Have you served on a multi-disciplinary staff for the purp	pose of developing an individi	rafized educatio	on program for a hi	adicapped stude	nt?		
1 Na (Go to question 9)	☐ 2. Yes	—♦ How many	times?				1
New rewarding was	the experience for you?						
							1
			rewarding				
9) Of the areas listed in questions 6 and 7, which three areas	de you led you have the grea	test seed for la	formation about at	the present time	7 Please Hat le en	der el	
greatest to least priority. (Only the number of these three	s alternatives need be given.)						l
!							
							ı
18) What is your feeling toward providing physical education (noncommo for chale of with his	• //	(Wasang				İ
☐ 1 Very favorable ☐ 2 Favorable	ш с постаносро	nds	4 Unfavorable	le 🛮 5.	Very unfavorab	le	1
11) Have you ever treght a student with each of the following (conditions?				•		ł
1 AMPUTATION		~ • •	en				
2 ARTHRITIS		<u> </u>	<u> </u>				
-	•	C 0 No					
3 BLINDVISUALLY HANDICAPPED		□ 0 Na	<u> </u>				
4 CARDIAC DISCRDERS		C 0 No	☐ 1 Yes				
5 CEREBRAL PALSY		C O No	1 Yes				
6 CEAF HEARING IMPAIRED		3 0 No	1 Yes				
7 SEVERE BEHAVIOR HANDICAP		C 0 No	C 1 Yes				
8 LEARNING DISABILITIES		□ 0 No	2 1 Yes				
9 MENTAL RETARDATION							l ——
10 MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY			<u> </u>			•	ļ
11 WHEELCHAIR-BOUND		C 0 No	C 1 Yes				j
		O No	☐ 1 Yes				
12. MULTI, MNDCAPPED		C 0 16	1 Yes				
13 OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)							1
		□ 0 Ne	☐ 1 Yes				
12) What is your feeling toward tracking a student with each o	i the followine meditions?						
			ė				1
	Very Favorable	Favorable	NeutraV N depends	(lalamente)	Yery	Des't	
1 AMPUTATION	ravorasis		•	Untaverable	Untaverable	Know	
2 ARTHRITIS		2	3	4	5	6	
3 BLINDAVISUALLY HANDICAPPED	1	2	3	4	5	3	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
4 CARDIAC DISCROERS	1	2	3	4	5	6	
5 CEREBRAL PALSY	1	2	3	4	5	6	
6 DEAFHEARING MPAIRED	1	2	3	4	5	6	1
	•	-					
7 SEVERE BEHAVIOR HANDICAP	1	2	3	4	5	6	
7 SEVERE BEHAVIOR HANDICAP 8 LEARNING DISARILITIES	1	2 2	3 3	4	•	-	
	1 •	2 2 2	3 3 3	4	5 5 5	6	
8 LEARNING DISARILITIES	1 1	2 2 2	3 3 3	4 4	•	-	
8 LEARNING DISARILITIES 5 "ENTAL RETARDATION 10 MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY	1 1 1	2 2 2 2 2 2	3 3 3 3	4 4 4	•	6	
8 LEARNING DISARILITIES 5 MENTAL RETARDATION 10 MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY 11 WHEELCHAIR-BOUND	1 1 1 1	2 2 2 2 2	3 3 3 3	4 4 4	•	6	
8 LEARNING DISARILITIES 5 "45"ITAL RETARDATION 10 MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY 11 WHEELCHAIR-BOUND 12 MULTIHANDICAPPED	1 1 1 1 1	2 2 2 2 2 2	3 3 3 3 3	4 4 4 4	•	6	
8 LEARNING DISARILITIES 5 MENTAL RETARDATION 10 MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY 11 WHEELCHAIR-BOUND	1 1 1 1 1		3 3 3 3 3 3 7	4 4 4 4 4	•	6	
8 LEARNING DISARILITIES 5 "E"ITAL RETARDATION 10 MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY 11 WHEELCHAIR-BOUND 12 MULTIHANDICAPPED	1 1 1 1 1 1		3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	4 4 4 4 4	5 5 5 5 5	6	

14MM IBAU			
AMPUTATION 1 Yes —		G. No	
5. Fear make condition worse	2 Can't communicate with then	<u> </u>	4. Lack of program content
. ARTHRITIS	☐ 6 Need too much attention	7 Lack of specialized	8. Other
1 Yes —	2. Can't communicate with then	I. No	5
Fear make condition worse	6. Need too much atention	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	4. Lack of program content
BLIND/VISUALLY IMPAIRED	C. Reed too modification	7. Lack of specialized training 8. No	☐ 8. Other
1_Yes	2. Can't communicate with then	نيسند 100 س ي	4. Lack of program content
5 Fear make condition worse	6. Need too much attention	7. Lack of specialized training	8. Other
CAROLAC DISORDERS		S. No	
1 Yes —	2. Can't communicate with then	n 3. Dislike being near them	4. Lack of program content
5 Fear make condition worse	6. Need too much attention	7. Lack of specialized training	☐ 8. Other
CEREBRAL PALSY		O. No	
<u> Yes →</u>	2. Can't communicate with then	n 3. Dislike being near them	4. Lack of program content
5 Fear make condition worse	☐, 6. Need too much attention	☐ 7. Lack of specialized training	☐ 8. Other
DEAFHEARING IMPAIRED		O. No	
1 Yes	2. Can't communicate with then	n 3 Distike being abar them	4. Lack of program content
5 Fear make condition worse	6. Need too much attention	7 Lack of specialized training	☐ 8. Other
SEVERE BEHAVIOR HANDICAP	5.4.6	0. No	
1 Yes — 5 Fear make condition worse	2. Can't communicate with them		4 Lack of program content
LEARNING DISABILITIES	6 Need too much attention	7 Lack of specialized training	☐ 8 Other
<u> Yes →</u>	2. Can I communicate with them	Oislike being near them	□ 4 1 ash at a
5 Fearmalle condition worse	6 Need too much attention	7 Lack of specialized training	4 Lack of program content 8. Other
MENTAL RETARDATION		0. No	U 6. Other
Yes —	2 Can't communicate with them		4 Lack of program content
5 Fear make condition worse	6 Need (00 much attention	☐ 7 Lack of specialized training	☐ 8. Other
MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY		O. No	
<u> Yes →</u>	2. Can't communicate with them	3 Dislike being near them	4 Lack of program content
5 Fear make condition worse	, 🔲 6. Need too much attention	7 Lack of specialized training	☐ 8. Other
WHEELCHAIR-SOUND		g. Ne	
<u> </u>	2 Can't communicate with them		4 Lack of program content
5 Fear make condition worse	☐ 6 Need too much attention	☐ 7 Lack of specialized training	☐ 8 Other
MULTIHANDICAPPED		0. No_	
Yes -	2 Can't communicate with them	3 Dislike being near them	4 Lack of program content
5 Fear make condition worse	☐ 6 Need too much attention	☐ 7 Lack of specialized training	
OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)		Ģ. ne	_
1 Van	544	.	
1 Yes —	2 Can't communicate with them	•	4 Lack of program content
5 Fear make condition worse	☐ 6 Need too much attention	7 Lack of specialized training	☐ 8 Other
OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)		8. No	
'_Yes	2 Can't communicate with them	n 3 Distike being near them	. 2 4 Lack of program content
5 Fear make condition worse	☐ 6 Need too much attention	I Lack of specialized fraining	•



		Do not allow! The school at Which I leach	Allend but do not have P E. tlasses	Attend but hove separate F E. eleases	Allend and are intograted lote regular P.E. elector	-56-
1. AMPUTATION		1	2	3	4	
2. ARTHRITIS		1	2	3	4	
3. BLIND/VISUALLY		1	2	3	4	
4. CARDIAC DISORDERS		1	2	3	4	
5. CEREBRAL PALSY		1	2	3	4	
6. DEAF/HEARING IMPAIRED		1	2	3	4	
7. SEVERE BEHAVIOR HANDIC	CAP	1	2	3	4	
8. LEARNING DISABILITIES		1	2	3	4	ı
9. MENTAL RETARDATION		1	2	3	4	
10. MUSCULAR DYSTROPHY		1	2	3	4	
11. WHEELCHAIR-BOUND		1	2	3	4	
12. MULTIHANDICAPPED		1	2	3	4	1
13. OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)						į
		1	2	3	4	į
14. OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)						
Do you receive encouragement an physical education for handicappe 1 Yes — What type o	of support from your administration of students? Please design of encouragement?	cribe.		endent, school board		
□ 0 No → What encou	uragement do you nee	d?				
Il hendicapped students are place normal students? (Please circle)	d in your regular physic:)	al education class <u>Yes</u>	ses, what limits the	m from participating	fully in activities with	
Activity chosen		1	0			
Total number of stude	rits in the class	1	0			
3 Functional ability of the	e individual	1	o			
4 Nature of the individua		1	-			
	•	1	0			
5 Availability of facilities	/equipment	1	0			Į.
Presence of architectu	ural barners	1	0			ı
7 Other (please specify))					1
<u></u>		1	0			
in your integrated classes, how many of	the mentar students react	In the student with	bandeser by below			
	and to form and the same to th				e not have integrated classe	.
					(Go to Question 19)	<u> </u>
a HOSTILE	1 Aimost ail	[] 2. Most	3. About hai	f 🛛 4. Some	☐ 5. Almost none	İ
b CURICUS	1 Almost atl	2. Most	3. About had	_	☐ 5. Almost none	1
U COMOUS	1 Almost all	2. Most	3. About had		☐ 5. Almost none	
c NEUTRAL	Ξ	2. Most	3. About had		☐ 5. Almost none	İ
	☐ 1 Almostall					
c NEUTRAL d ACCOMMODATING	<u> </u>	= ' ' '	1 About her	1 [] A Come	[] [Alexand Assa	
c NEUTRAL	1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all	2. Most	3. About had		5. Almost none	
C NEUTRAL d ACCOMINGUATING e OVERLY CONSIDERATE	1 Almosi all	2. Most 2. Most	C 3 About had	f 4 Some	☐ 5. Almost none	
c NEUTRAL d ACCOMINGUATING e OVERLY CONSIDERATE f RIDICULING g RESENTMENT	1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all	2. Most 2. Most 2. Most 2. Most	3 About had	f	5. Almost none 5. Almost none	
c NEUTRAL d ACCOMIN-CDATING e OVERLY CONSIDERATE f RIDICULING g RESENTMENT Te what extent do you interact with the r	1 Almosi all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all	2. Most 2. Most 2. Most 2. Most	3 About had	f	5. Almost none 5. Almost none	rciative
c NEUTRAL d ACCOMINGEATING e OVERLY CONSIDERATE f RIDICULING g RESENTMENT Te what extent do you interact with the r to providing physical education for hand	1 Aimosi all 1 Aimosi all 1 Aimost all 1 Aimost ## Medical and attled medical ficapped stateats?	2. Most 2. Most 2. Most 2. Most	3 About has 3. About has bysical therapist, ecc	d 4 Some d 2 Some specienci therapist) pre	5. Almost nane 5. Almost nane 5. Almost nane fessions in your community	relative
c NEUTRAL d ACCOMIN-CDA / ING e OVERLY CONSIDERATE f RIDICULING g RESENTMENT To what extent do you interact with the r to providing physical education for hand 1 Never 2 1-2 times per	1 Almosi all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almosi all 1 Alm	2. Most 2. Most 2. Most 3. Most 4. (e.g., physicians, physicians, physicians)	3 About had 3. About had bysical therapist, acc	d	5. Almost none 5. Almost none	relative
c NEUTRAL d ACCOMINGEATING e OVERLY CONSIDERATE f RIDICULING g RESENTMENT To what extent do you interact with the r to providing physical education for hand 1 Never 2 1-2 times per How interested are you in teaching hand	1 Almosi all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almosi all 1 Alm	2. Most 2. Most 2. Most 3. Most 4. (e.g., physicians, physicians, physicians)	3 About had 3. About had bysical therapist, acc	d	5. Almost nane 5. Almost nane 5. Almost nane fessions in your community	rsiative
c NEUTRAL d ACCOMINGEATING e OVERLY CONSIDERATE f RIDICULING g RESENTMENT To what extent do you interact with the r to providing physical education for hand 1 Never 2 1-2 times per How interested are you in teaching hand	1 Almosi all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almosi all 1 Alm	2. Most 2. Most 2. Most 3. Most 4. (e.g., physicians, physicians, physicians)	3 About hai 3. About hai bysical therepist, ecc 6-9 times per year	d	☐ 5. Almost none ☐ 5. Almost none dessions in year community hore times per year	
c NEUTRAL d ACCOMIN-CDATING e OVERLY CONSIDERATE f RIDICULING g RESENTMENT To what extent do you interact with the ripervising physical education for hand 1 Never 2 1-2 times per How interested are you in teaching hand 1 Very interested 2 S	1 Almosi all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almosi all 1 Alm	2. Most 2. Most 2. Most 2. Most 2. Most (e.g., physicians,) per year 4 to inaching see-	3 About hai 3. About hai hysical therepist, ecs 6-9 times per year hendicapped stadents fixed 4 S	f	☐ 5. Almost none ☐ 5. Almost none dessions in year community hore times per year	
c NEUTRAL d ACCOMIN-CDA FING e OVERLY CONSIDERATE f RIDICULING g RESENTMENT To what extent do you interact with the providing physical education for hand 1 Never 2 1-2 times per How interested are you in teaching hand 1 Very interested 2 S As an endergraduate, did you have any	1 Almost ail 1 Al	2. Most 2. Most 2. Most 2. Most 3. Most 4. (e.g., physicians,) 4 to to traching see-	3 About hal 3. About hal biysical therapist, ece 6-9 times per year bendicapped students fixed 4 Secretion to headicappe	# 4 Some # Some speciated therapiat) pre 5 10 or n 7 Omewhat uninterested # students?	5. Almost none 5. Almost none 5. Almost none iterations in year community terms per year 5 Very unint	erested
c NEUTRAL d ACCOMIN-CDA FING e OVERLY CONSIDERATE f RIDICULING g RESENTMENT To what extent do you interact with the rise providing physical education for hand 1 Never 2 1-2 times per How interested are you in teaching hand 1 Very interested 2 S As an endergraduate, did you have any: 1 None 2 P	1 Almost all 1 Al	2. Most 2. Most 2. Most 2. Most 2. Most (e.g., physicians,) per year 4 to inaching see-	3 About hai 3. About hai hysical therepist, ece 6-9 times per year hendicapped students fixed 4 S scattes to hendicappe 4 2-4 c	# 4 Some # Some speciated therapist) pre 5 10 or n 7 omewhat uninterested students? Ourses	☐ 5. Almost none ☐ 5. Almost none dessions in year community hore times per year	erested
c NEUTRAL d ACCOMIN-CDATING e OVERLY CONSIDERATE f RIDICULING g RESENTMENT To what extent do you interact with the is to providing physical education for hand 1 Never 2 1-2 times per New interested are you in teaching hand 1 Very interested 2 S As an endergraduate, did you have any: 1 None 2 P What was your age on your last birthday	1 Almost ail 1 Al	2. Most 2. Most 2. Most 2. Most 3. Most 4. (e.g., physicians,) 4 to to traching see-	3 About hai 3. About hai hysical therepist, ece 6-9 times per year hendicapped students fixed 4 S scattes to hendicappe 4 2-4 c	# 4 Some # Some speciated therapiat) pre 5 10 or n 7 Omewhat uninterested # students?	5. Almost none 5. Almost none 5. Almost none iterations in year community terms per year 5 Very unint	erested
c NEUTRAL d ACCOMIN-CDA FING e OVERLY CONSIDERATE f RIDICULING g RESENTMENT To what extent do you interact with the ripoviding physical education for hand 1 Never 2 1-2 times per How interested are you in teaching hand 1 Very interested 2 S As an endergraduate, did you have any: 1 None 2 P What was your age on your last birthday What is you sex? 3 1 Male	1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 2 Al	2. Most 2. Most 2. Most 2. Most 3. Most 4. (e.g., physicians,) 4 to to traching see-	3 About hai 3. About hai hysical therepist, ece 6-9 times per year hendicapped students fixed 4 S scattes to hendicappe 4 2-4 c	# 4 Some # Some speciated therapist) pre 5 10 or n 7 omewhat uninterested students? Ourses	5. Almost none 5. Almost none 5. Almost none 6. Almost none 6. Almost none 6. Almost none 7. Almost none 7. Almost none 8. Almost none 9.	erested uses
c NEUTRAL d ACCOMIN-CDA FING e OVERLY CONSIDERATE f RIDICULING g RESENTMENT To what extent do you interact with the r to providing physical education for hand 1 Never 2 1-2 times per How interested are you in teaching hand 1 Very interested 2 S As an endergraduate, slid you have any 1 None 2 P What was your age on your last birthday What is you sex? 1 Made	1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 1 Almost all 2 Al	2. Most 2. Most 2. Most 2. Most 3. Most 4. (e.g., physicians,) 4 to to traching see-	☐ 3 About hal ☐ 3. About hal ☐ blysical therepist, ecc 6-9 times per year hendicapped students fixed ☐ 4 S scritten to handicappe 4 2-4 c — Y	# 4 Some # Some speciated therapist) pre 5 10 or n 7 omewhat uninterested students? Ourses	5. Almost none 5. Almost none 5. Almost none 6. Almost none 6. Almost none 6. Almost none 7. Almost none 7. Almost none 8. Almost none 9.	erested uses
c NEUTRAL d ACCOMINODATING e OVERLY CONSIDERATE f RIDICULING g RESENTMENT To what extent do you interact with the is to providing physical education for hand 1 Never 2 1-2 times per How interested are you in teaching hand 1 Very interested 2 2 S As an endergraduate, did you have any: 1 None 2 P What was your age on your last birthday What is you sex? 1 Maie For how many years have you been teach	1 Almost all 1 Al	2. Most 2. Most 2. Most 2. Most 3. (e.g., physicians,) 4 per year 4 to inaching non-l 3. Neutral/h Baching physical ed 3. One course	☐ 3 About hal ☐ 3. About hal ☐ blysical therepist, ecc 6-9 times per year hendicapped students fixed ☐ 4 S scritten to handicappe 4 2-4 c — Y	# 4 Some # Some species (therapist) pre 5 10 or n 7 omewhat uninterested # stedents? ourses ears	5. Almost none 5. Almost none 5. Almost none iterations in year community terms per year 5 Very unint	erested uses
c NEUTRAL d ACCOMIN-CDA FING e OVERLY CONSIDERATE f RIDICULING g RESENTMENT To what extent do you interact with the ripervising physical education for hand 1 Never 2 1-2 times per How interested are you in teaching hand 1 Very interested 2 S As an endergraduate, did you have any 1 None 2 P What was your age on your last birthday	1 Almost all 1 Al	2. Most 2. Most 2. Most 2. Most 3. (e.g., physicians,) 4 per year 4 to inaching non-l 3. Neutral/h Baching physical ed 3. One course	☐ 3 About hai ☐ 3. About hai ☐ 3. About hai ☐ 3. About hai ☐ 3. About hai ☐ 4. Services per year ☐ 4. Services to handicappe ☐ 4. 2-4-0 ☐ Y	# 4 Some # Some	5. Almost none 5. Almost none 5. Almost none 6. Almost none 6. Almost none 6. Almost none 7. Almost none 7. Almost none 8. Almost none 9.	erested uses

APPENDIX D

Questions and Question Responses - 1988



TOTAL RESPONDENTS = 242 (100.0%)

Please check the box or circle the appropriate responses to the questions below. Feel free to add your comments on any question either on this form or on a separate sheet of paper. Please check an answer for all questions. Give the answer which is closest to your view if no response applies exactly.

1.	What _s the total number of handicapped students who participate in all of your physical education classes?
	None
	1-5
	6-10
	10-14
	15-19
	20-39
	40+
	No response
2.	Of the handicapped students who participate, what number are:
	Integrated into regular classes ' 146 (7.0 ave.)
	Segregated into special classes 43 (4.7 ave.)
	Both
	Other (please describe:) 7 (0.4 ave.)
3.	What is your feeling toward teaching physical education for students with handicapping conditions?
	Very favorable
	Favorable
	Neutral/mixed
	Unfavorable
	Very unfavorable
	No response

4. Which of the following does the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-142) provide for?

,	202.	<u>ïes</u>	<u>No</u>	No response
(a)	Mainstreaming all handicapped children in the regular classroom	109 (45.0%)	107 (44.2%)*	26 (10.7%)
(b)	Funds at the local level to provide teachers with inservice activities designed to help them teach handicapped students	113 (46.7%)*	98 (40.5%)	31 (12.8%)
(c)	An individualized education program for each handicapped student receiving special education	137 (56.6%)*	76 (31.4%)	29 (12.0%)
(d)	Adapted physical education placement for each handicapped student	115 (47.5%)	100 (41.3%)*	27 (11.2%)
(•)	Assessment of students' abilities with valid and reliable test instruments	143 (59.1%)*	70 (28.9%)	29 (12.0%)
(£)	Parents' participation in the development of the individualized education program, including placement of the student in the appropriate physical education class	135 (55.8%)*	79 (32.6%)	28 (11.6%)
		*Correct respo	224	

*Correct response

5. P.L. 94-142 mandates that handicapped children receive, if necessary, special education including instruction in physical education. How capable are you in executing the following responsibilities:

	Very capable	Somewhat capable	Somewhat incapable	Very incapable	No response
(a)	Identifying founding individualized	deral and state legi deducation programs.	islative requirements	s associated wit	h
	20 (8.3%)	101(41.7%)	63 (26.0%)	51 (21.1%)	7 (2.9%)
(b)	Developing an	individualized educa	ation program for the	handicapped st	udent.
	50 (20.7%)	124 (51.2%)	48 (19.8%)	13 (5.4%)	7 (2.9%)
(c)	Demonstrating handicapped st	appropriate instruct	cional strategies in	the classroom w	ith
	48 (19.3%)	128 (52.3%)	48 (19.8%)	11 (4.5%)	7 (2.9%)



(d)	Effectively	using commercial ar	ed teacher-made inst	ructional materia	ils.			
	73 (30.2%)	116 (47.9%)	35 (14.5%)	9 (3.7%)	9 (3.7%)			
(•)		federal and state in nondiscriminatory	legislative requirem evaluation.	ents associated w	ith the			
	22 (9.1%)	95 (39.3%)	83 (34.25)	35 (14.5%)	7 (2.9%)			
(£)	• •	Identifying federal and state legisl-tive requirements associated with the principle of mainstreaming.						
	30 (12.4%)	110 (45.5%)	60 (24.8%)	35 (14.5%)	7 (2.9%)			
(g)		ucational placement r a handicapped stu	ts in defining the l	east restrictive	appropriate			
	30 (12.4%)	110 (45.5%)	64 (26.4%)	30 (12.4%)	8 (3.3%)			

6. Do you feel you need more information on each of the following in order to teach physical education to handicapped students more effectively?

			<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>	No I	esponse
(1)	Knowledge of P.L. 94-142	185	(76.4%)	52	(21.5%)	5	(2.1%)
(2)	Understanding the nature of specific handicaps	197	(81.4%)	41	(16.9%)	4	(1.7%)
(3)	Techniques of motor assessment	182	(75.2%)	56	(23.1%)	4	(1.7%)
(4)	Awareness of existing curricular materials	198	(81.8%)	40	(16.5%)	4	(1.7%;
(5)	Knowledge of medical terms	165	(68.2%)	71	(29.3%)	6	(2.5%)
(6)	Hands-on experience with handicapped stucents	157	(64.9%)	79	(32.6%)	6	(2.5%)
(7)	Procedures for organizing and running adapted P.E. programs	168	(69.4%)	69	(28.5%)	5	(2.1%)
(8)	Knowledge of class placement alternatives (i.e., special, adapted, and so on)	179	(94.0%)	57	(23.6%)	6	(2.5%)
(9)	Understanding of behavior management techniques	166	(68.6%)	69	(28.5%)	7	(2.9%)
(10)	Other	12	(5.0%)	0	(0.0%)	230	(95.0%)
(11)	Other	1	(0.4%)		(0.4%)	240	(99.2%)

7. Have you taken any steps to increase your knowledge of each of the following in order to teach physical education to handicapped students more effectively?

		Yes	<u>No</u>	No Response
(1)	Knowledge of P.L. 94-142	78 (32.2%)	155 (64.0%)	9 (3.7%)
	Understanding the nature of specific handicaps	150 (62.0%)	84 (34.7%)	8 (3.3%)
• •	Techniques of motor assessment	115 (47.5%)	119 (49.2%)	8 (3.3%)
	Awareness of existing curricular materials	93 (38.4%)	141 (58.3%)	8 (3.3%)
(5)	Knowledge of medical terms	120 (49.6%)	112 (46.3%)	10 (4.1%)
(6)	Hands-on experience with handicapped students	142 (58.7%)	92 (38.0%)	8 (3.3%)
(7)	Procedures for organizing and running adapted P.E. programs	111 (45.9%)	123 (50.8%)	8 (3.3%)
(8)	Knowledge of class placement alternatives (i.e., special, adapted, and so on)	83 (34.3%)	149 (61.6%)	10 (4.1%)
(9)	Understanding of behavior management techniques	118 (48.8%)	113 (46.7%)	11 (4.5%)
(10)	Other	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.4%)	241 (99.6%)

8a. In which areas of motor behavior assessment do you need assistance?

	<u>No</u>	Yes	No response
Fundamental motor skills/ patterns	112 (46.3%)	121 (50.0%)	9 (3.7%)
Physical/motor fitness	120 (49.6%)	116 (47.9%)	6 (2.5%)
Sports skills tests (including aquatics and dance)	89 (36.8%)	147 (60.7%)	6 (2.5%)
Perceptual-motor development	64 (26.4%)	170 (70.2%)	8 (3.3%)
Other (specify)	1 (0.4%)	1 (0.4%)	240 (99.2%)
Other (specify)	1 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)	241 (99.6%)



8b.	Have you served on a multi-disciplinary staff for the purpose of developing an individualized education program for a handicapped student?
	No 200 (82.6%)
	Yes
	No response
	(If yes) How rewarding was the experience for you?
	Very rewarding 11 (4.5%)
	Somewhat rewarding 20 (8.3%)
	Not very rewarding 4 (1.7%)
	Very unrewarding 0 (0.0%)
	No response 207 (85.5*
	#1 Knowledge of P.L. 94-142 26.9% #9 Understanding of behavior management techniques 15.3% #2 Understanding the nature 14.9% of specific handicaps #3 Techniques of motor 11.6% assessment
10.	What is your feeling toward providing physical education programs for students with handicapping conditions?
	Very favorable 117 (48.3%)
	Favorable
	Neutral/it depends
	Unfavorable 2 (0.8%)
	Very unfavorable 3 (1.2%)



11. Have you ever taught a student with each of the following conditions?

	<u>Nc</u>	<u>Yes</u>	No Response
(1) Amputation	145 (55.9%)	84 (34.7%)	13 (5.4%)
(2) Arthritis	81 (33.5%)	151 (62.4%)	10 (4.1%)
(3) Blind/visually handicapped	109 (45.0%)	121 (50.0%)	12 (5.0%)
(4) Cardiac disorder	77 (31.8%)	155 (64.0%)	10 (4.1%)
(5) Cerebral palsy	113 (46.7%)	115 (47.5%)	14 (5.8%)
(6) Deaf/hearing impaired	80 (33.1%)	150 (57.0%)	12 (5.0%)
(7) Severe behavior handicap	66 (27.3%)	165 (68.2%)	11 (4.5%)
(8) Learning disabilities	7 (2.9%)	229 (94.6%)	6 (2.5%)
(9) Mental retardation	85 (35.1%)	145 (60.0%)	12 (5.0%)
(10) Muscular dystrophy	158 (65.3%)	69 (28.5%)	15 (6.2%)
(11) Wheelchair-bound	153 (63.2%)	75 (31.0%)	14 (5.8%)
(12) Multihandicapped	122 (50.4%)	89 (36.8%)	31 (12.8%)
(13) Other (please specify)	2 (0.8%)	20 (8.3%)	220 (90.9%)

12. What is your feeling towards teaching a student with each of the following conditions?

Very fa prable	Favorable	Neutral it depends	Unfavorable	Very unfavorable	Don't know	No respc.ise
(1) Amputation	ı					
85 (35.1%)	81 (33.5%)	55 (22.7%)	8 (3.3%)	3 (1.2%)	4 (1.7%)	6 (2.5%)
(2) Arthritis						
102 (42.19	95 (39.3%)	34 (14.0%)	3 (1.2%)	1 (0.4%)	1 (0.4%)	6 '2.5%)
(3) Blind/visu	ally handicappe	d				
65 (26.9%)	77 (31.8%)	65 (26.9%)	15 (6.2%)	7 (2.9%)	5 '2.1%)	8 (3.3%)
(4) Cardiac di	isorders					
68 (28.1%)	76 (31.4%)	57 (27.7%)	11 (4.5%)	8 (3.3%)	4 (1.7%)	8 (3.3%)



Very favorable	Favorable	Neutral it depends	Unfavorable	Very <u>infavorable</u>	Don't <u>know</u>	No response		
(5) Cerebral p	alsy							
59 (28.5%)	74 (30.6%)	51 (21.1%)	22 (9.1%)	6 (2.5%)	11 (4.5%)	9 (3.7%)		
(6) Deaf/heari	ng impaired							
88 (36.4%)	84 (34.7%)	44 (18.2%)	9 (3.7%)	3 (1.2)	7 (2.9)	7 (2.9%)		
(7) Severe beh	avior handicap							
55 (22.7%)	53 (21.9%)	70 (28.9%)	31 (12.8%)	22 (9.1%)	6 (2 5%)	5 (2.1%)		
(8) Learning d	isabilities							
\$9 (38.0 <u>%)</u>	93 (38.4%)	41 (16.9%)	2 (0.8%)	6 (2.5%)	1 (0.4%)	7 (2.9%)		
(9) Mental ret	ardation							
68 (28.1%)	77 (31.8%)	52 (21.5%)	16 (6.6%)	11 (4.5%)	9 (3.7%)	9 (3.7%)		
(10) Muscular	dystrophy							
63 (* 🚯)	63 (26.0%)	69 (28.5%)	19 (7.4%)	7 (2.9%)	13 (5.4%)	9 (3.7%)		
(11) Wheelche!	cound							
67 (27.7%)	56 (23.1%)	68 (28.1)	19 (7.9%)	12 (5.0%)	12 (5.0%)	8 (3.3%)		
(12) Multihand	icapped							
55 (22.7%)	41 (16.9%)	79 (32.6%)	?" (9.9%)	15 (6.2%)	15 (6.2%)	13 (5.4%)		
(13) Other								
2 (0.%) 2	(0.8%) 2 /	9%) 0	(0.0%) 0	(0.0%, 0	(0.0%) 2	36 (97.5%)		
(14) Other								
2 (0.8%, 0	(0.0%) 0 (0	.0%)	(0.0%) 0	(0.0%) 0	(0.0%) 2	40 (99.2%)		
13. Do you feel a need to expand your knowledge of physical education programming for each of the following conditions in order to teach physical education for such students more effectively? If you feel that you need additional information in order to work more effectively with each of the following types of students, what are the reasons that contribute to your need? CH: LLT. THAT APPLY. Can't communicate with them								
— Disl	ike being near	them		(Item contin	ued)			



Lack of program content
 Fear make condition worse
Need too much attention
Lack of specialized training
Other

			Yes		<u>Но</u>	<u>N</u>	Response
(1)	Amputation	162	(66.9%)	71	(29.3%)	9	(3.7%)
(2)	Arthritis	142	(58.7%)	91	(37.6%)	9	(3.7%)
(3)	Blind/visually impaired	174	(71.9%)	59	(24.4%)	9	(3.7%)
(4)	Cardiac disorders	161	(66.5%)	72	(29.8%;	9	(3.7%)
(5)	Cerebral palsy	177	(73.1%)	56	(23.1%)	9	(3.7%)
(6)	Deaf/hearing impaired	153	(63.2%)	79	(32.6%)	10	(4.1%)
(7)	Severe behavior handicup	171	(70.7%)	62	(25.6%)	9	(3.7%)
(8)	Learning disabilities	113	(46.7%)	119	(49.2%)	10	(4.1%)
(9)	Mental retardation	157	(64.9%)	75	(31.0)	10	(4.1%)
(10)	Muscular dystrophy	183	(75.6%)	50	(20.7%)	9	(3.7%)
(11)	Wheelchair-bound	177	(73.1%)	56	(23.1%)	9	(3.7%)
(12)	Multihandicapped	183	(75.6%)	50	(20.7%)	9	(3.7%)
(**)	Other (please specify)	3	(1.2%)	3	(1.2%)	236	(97.5%)
(14)	Other (please specify)	1	(0.4%)	3	(1.2%)	238	(98.3%)

14. Of the conditions listed above, which have you indicated you need more information on; which three do you need most? Please list in order of greatest to least need. (Only the number of each of these need be given)

#7	Severe behavior handicap	18.29
#4	Cardiac disorders	11.29
#3	Blind/visually impaired	9.51



15. Of the following handicapping conditions, what is their current status in your school and physical education program? (Please circle)

Do not the schewhich I	ool at	Attend but do not have P.E. classes	Attend but have separate P.E. classes	Attend and are integrated into regular P.E. classes.	No Response
(1) Am	putation				
17	2 (71.1%)	4 (1.7%)	10 (4.1%)	39 (16.1%)	17 (7.0%)
(2) Ar	thritis				
10	5 (43.4%)	5 (2.1%)	11 (4.5%)	106 (43.8%)	15 (6.2%)
(3) Bl	ind/visually	handicapped			
15	6 (64.5%)	3 (1.2%)	22 (9.1%)	47 (19.4%)	14 (5.8%)
(4) Ca	rdiac disord	ers			
87	(35.9%)	18 (7.4%)	14 (5.8%)	104 (43.0%)	19 (7.9%)
(5) Ce	rebral palsy	,			
13	4 (55.4%)	6 (2.5%)	23 (9.5%)	64 (26.4%)	15 (6.2%)
(6) De	af/hearing i	mpaired			
12	1 (50.0%)	0 (0.0%)	20 (8.3%)	81 (33.5%)	20 (8.3%)
(7) Se	vere behavio	r handicap			
10	5 (43.4%)	4 (1.7%)	25 (10.3%)	94 (20.8%)	14 (5.8%)
(8) Le	arning d'sab	ilities			
27	(11.2%)	2 (0.8%)	33 (13.6%)	170 (70.2%)	10 (4.1%)
(9) Me	ntal retarda	ition			
12	4 (51.2%)	3 (1.2%)	25 (10.3%)	69 (28.5%)	21 (8.7%)
(10) Mu	scular dystr	орћу			
16	6 (68.6%)	8 (3.3%)	21 (8.7%)	26 (10.7%)	21 (8.7%)
(11) Wh	eelchair-bou	ind			
16	66 (68.6%)	13 (5.4%)	18 (7.3%)	29 (:2.0%)	16 (6.6%)
(12) Mu	iltihandicapp	ed			
15	64 (63.6%)	12 (5.0%)	22 (9.1%)	28 (11.6%)	26 (10.7%)



	the	not attend school at th I teach		Attend but have separate 7.2. classes	Attend and are integrated into regular P.E. classes	No <u>Response</u>
	(13	Other (ple	ase specify)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
		2 (0.8%)	1 (0.4%)	2 (0.8%)	9 (3.7%)	228 (94.2%)
	(14)	Other (ple	ase specify)			
		0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (1.2%)	239 (98.8%)
16.	supe	Brintendent,	<pre>encouragement and school board, etc se describe.</pre>	support from your a .) to provide physi	dministration (i.e., cal education for he	, principal, andicapp e d
		Yes		101	(41.7%)	
		What type	of encouragement?_			
		No		10	7 (44.2%)	
		What encou	ragement do you ne	oa?		
17.	If h		e students are place.		4 (14.0%) hysical education cl	
	limi	.ts them fro	m participating ful	lly in activities w	ith normal students:	Please
				<u>Ye s</u>	<u>No</u>	No response
	(1)	Activity c	hosen	146 (60.3%)	63 (26.0%)	33 (13.6%)
	(2)	Total numbin the cla	er of students	114 (47.1%)	96 (39.7%)	32 (13.2%)
	(3)	Functional individual	ability of the	179 (74.0%)	36 (14.9%)	27 (11.2%)
	(4)	Nature of handicap	the individual's	183 (75.6%)	35 (14.5%)	24 (9.9%)
	(5)	Availabili equipment	ty of facilities/	136 (56.2%)	80 (33.1%)	26 (10.7%)
	(6)	Presence o	f architectural	84 (34.7%)	122 (50.4%)	36 (14.9%)
	(7)	Other (ple	ase specif()	13 (5.4%)	1 (0.4%)	228 (94.2%)



18. In your integrated classes, how many of the regular students reac to the students with handicaps by being: NOTE: Do not have integrated classes - 31 (12.8%)

	Almost all	Most	About half	Some	Almost none	No response
(a)	Hostile					
	1 (0.4%)	4 (1.7%)	7 (2.9%)	47 (19.4%)	134 (55.4%)	18 (7.4%)
(b)	Curious					
	18 (7.4%)	25 (10.3%)	20 (8.3%)	88 (36.4%)	43 (17.8%)	17 (7.0%)
(c)	Neutral					
	55 (22.7%)	52 (21.5%)	32 (13.2%)	40 (16.5%)	13 (5.4%)	19 (7.9%)
(b)	Accommodating					
	52 (21.5%)	73 (30.2%)	24 (9.9%)	33 (13.6%)	_3 (5.4%)	16 (6.6%)
(●)	Overly conside	erate				
	13 (5.4%)	22 (9.1%)	25 (10.3%)	85 (35.1%)	47 (19.4%)	19 (7.5%)
(f)	Ridiculing					
	1 (9.4%)	8 (3.3%)	7 (2.9%)	72 (29.8%)	104 (43.0%)	19 (7.9%)
(g)	Resentment					
	2 (0.8%)	2 (0.8%)	5 (2.1%)	45 (18.6%)	138 (57.0%)	19 (7.9%)

19. To what extent do you interact with the medical and allied medical (e.g., physicians, physical therapist, occupational therapist) professions in your community relative to providing physical education for handicapped students?

Nover	141	(58.3%)
1-2 times per year	65	(26.9%)
3-5 times per year	12	(5.0%)
6-9 times per year	4	(1.78)
10 or more times per year	12	(5.0%)
No response	8	(3.3%)

20. How interested are you in teaching handicapped students (compared to teaching non-handicapped students)?

Very interested							27	(11.23)
Somewhat interested							58	(24.0%)
Neutral/mixed							95	(39.3%)
Somewhat uninterested	l						30	(12.4%)
Very uninterested .							26	(10.78)
No response								



21. As an undergraduate, did you have any specialized instruction in teaching physical education to handicapped students? Part of a course 24 (9.9%) No response 8 (3.3%) 22. What was your age on your last birthday? N = 232Hean = 35.0 years Median = 37.2 years Range = 23 to 64 years 23. What is your sex? 5 (2.1%) 24. For how many years have you been teaching? N = 236 Mean = 14.3 years Median = 14.2 years Range = 1 to 33 years 25. What is the approximate total enrollment of the school(s) at which you teach? 5 (2.1%) 64 (26.4%) 87 (35.9%) 52 (21.5) 17 (7.0%) 9 (3.7%) 8 (3.3%) 26. Would you describe the school(s) at which you teach as: Urban 194 (80.2%)



22 (9.1%) 5 (2.1%)